

THE
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW.

NO. 3.—JULY, 1897.

I.

THE MATERIAL BASIS OF INHERITANCE AND THE
PROBLEM OF EVIL. (Second part.)

BY RICHARD C. SCHIEDT.

SUMMING up what has been said in the first part of the discussion, I preface the second part with the following propositions:

1. The chief characteristic qualities of an individual organism are contained potentially in the germ-cells.

2. Each parent transmits its hereditary characteristics by means of one single germ-cell.

3. The material substance of hereditary transmission is the highly coloring protoplasm or chromatin in the nucleus of the germ-cell.

4. The chromatin bodies or chromosomes perfectly agree in form, size and number in the two sexes of a definite species, but vary in different species.

5. Before or during this union the hereditary substance of both the male and female cell is reduced to one-half of the original amount found in the typical cell by the separation of the so-called polar bodies, so that the sum total of the chromatin bodies of the fertilized egg would be equal to that of each original germ-cell.

6. The multicellular body is the result of the repeated cleav-

age of the fertilized ovum, ultimately differentiated into the elements of the various tissues.

7. The chromosomes multiply by division and are transmitted from cell to cell in the process of division until again germ-cells arise containing the same hereditary substance in the same proportion as the original cells from which they were derived.

8. The differentiation of tissue is produced by extra-nuclear heredity; only a number of chromosomes emigrate into the surrounding protoplasm; they are influenced by the specific functions of the locality, and produce a specific tissue, while the rest remain latent.

9. The *transmission* of individual character is, therefore, the function of the *nucleus*, its *development*, the function of *protoplasm* and *environment*.

10. The activity of the cell is dependent upon the variations in the process of nutrition.

These facts apply to plants and animals alike; they have been the same from times immemorial to the present; they exhibit to us the tools used in the great workshop of life. They offer a more complete definition of life than Herbert Spencer has given, when he says that "life is the continual adjustment of inner relations to outer relations." We must add that it is not only the adjustment of inner relations to outer relations, but also the reverse, as well as of inner relations among themselves; or, it is a process of mutual adjustment of all the parts engaged in it. These phenomena are, therefore, the manifestations of organic life in its broadest sense; they alone proclaim its absolute unity. In its lowest forms they reveal to us organic functions apparently without the vehicle of particular form, and, as we advance in the scale of existence, they demonstrate more clearly the particular relation of function to form, and still more wonderfully the dependence of form upon individualization. In the simplest cases, viz.: that of *Pandorina*, *Euglena* and *Volvox*, the parental chromosomes exhibit the most profound function of life, *i. e.*, that of self preservation, or reproduction almost to the total exclusion of all others and the first differentiated individual is a reproductive individual; next the

function of nutrition becomes individualized and nutritive cells are particularized with the rise of the sponges, while the corals and kindred animals demonstrate the individualization of muscular function and form. In each case, however, the antecedent is transmitted to the following, so that the higher always becomes the heir of the lower. Each function becomes, as it were, individualized in form, in order to develop in harmony with given conditions of the environment in its manifold variations. Sensation naturally involved in all the functions of life passes through a series of individualizations before it reaches its predominant character in man. *Inheritance is, therefore, first of all, that of function and form* transmitted through the chromosomes which, in the case of man, partake of all the manifold developments of the organic world. The separation of form and function is, however, an abstraction, as is that of matter and motion; we can hardly suppose the connection of particular functions with particular forms, *i. e.*, particular organization, to be accidental, any more than we can suppose the particular properties of particular inorganic composites and elements to be accidental, or those particular properties to be without results in the organic matter into which the particular composites and elements are taken up. The environment must contain complementary conditions of function in order that the individual may even come into existence and survive at all. The great question then is, how much must be allowed for original tendency and how much is to be attributed to the account of the action of environment. No matter how far back we may go, even if we go beyond the organic, we must come to irresolvable elements whose motion, as distinct and particular action and reaction, must have definite form. The ultimate elements of the lowest organism thus represent positive factors and the primal organism itself must be regarded as a positive factor without which the development of the highest organism would be impossible. We must, therefore, regard it as an independent force that prefigures the whole animate kingdom. We would then define an organism from the physical point of view, to be simply form (*i. e.* organization) and function; subtracting these we subtract the organism.

This fundamental organic inheritance present in the reproductive elements of man as well as of the plant and capable of adjusting itself to variations in environment, must be reckoned with in the discussion of ethical questions. I do not make the assumption that the psychical is dependent on the physical, nor do I mean to assert that the psychical can be measured by the weights and measures of the physical, all I claim is that there is always a physical function connected with the psychical and that the relation between the two is not a variable but a constant one, *i. e.*, that whatever the metaphysical truth as to the freedom of the will, such freedom cannot interfere with the constancy of nature. However, some one may ask, what do you mean by nature? If we take into consideration that the processes described above are invisible to the naked eye and in their ultimate manifestation invisible to any aid man can employ, we conclude that in the ordinary sense of the word we have to deal here with processes immaterial rather than material, that the physical manifestations exhibit the progressive revelation of a power which baffles the understanding of the wisest of men, a power which we call God. We must, however, add that while it is true that matter *per se* never progresses, it is also true that whenever function becomes organized (individualized) in form, such ultimate expression establishes definite fixed laws which maintain their constancy in every subsequent progressive movement. The constancy of nature, therefore, seems to be bound up with individualism, reaching from the inorganic to man, or from the ultimate elements of the lowest organism as positive factors to the highest manifestations of manhood. The propagation of species is, in one sense, an isolated fact, but in like sense is the evaporation of water or the formation of the crystal of a particular chemical; but none of these phenomena are isolated in any other sense, as less or more than a part of a universal whole. None is a greater mystery than the other, the propagation of animal form no greater than the continued flowing of a stream in spite of evaporation, or the growth of a crystal to the form of its kind. *Inheritance*, therefore, involves a constancy of law which is normal and influences volition.

If we then assume a progressive revelation, tending towards the establishment of constancy, we must, at the same time, accept the fact of progressive inheritance. What has become constant in protozoan revelation enters as a factor *per se* in all higher development, function expressing itself in ever higher form through the medium of individualization. The reproductive cells of man would thus represent, by virtue of progressive inheritance, complex individualism, and so it does, as the embryonic stages of human development sufficiently prove. We find, however, that in every case, form or organization precedes function, showing that form and locality, if once individualized, become constant; the function only becomes operative in the proper environment, *e. g.*, the digestive organs only begin to perform their functions after their development is completed and their proper environment is established; so long, however, function seems latent, or rather, specialized function is only one, viz.: that of growth. Only the chromosomes of the nuclear substance are active in the process of division. Thus we find the fundamental functions of reproduction, growth and nutrition purely cellular, that is active in all the cells of the body alike, while organization as such becomes functional with the completion of the whole individual. *Progressive inheritance, then, is conditioned by perfect environment.* Under the most primitive conditions the primitive factors are self assertive, the more specialized the environment the more differentiated is the response of the higher factors. In any case, however, the transmission is by chromosomes, possessing the power of adaptation and obeying the law of progressive revelation; function and form must be ever operative in them in such a way that all the factors are interdependent. Exercise of function is impossible without a sufficient complementary factor in the environment, but this is evidently sufficient only with the existence of that tendency in the organism of which it is the complement. I can, therefore, not accept the theory of the determinists, chief of whom is Professor Weissman, of Freiburg, who maintain that every set of chromosomes is predestined to become a definite organ. The most thorough-going experiments have dis-

proved such claims which at one time fascinated quite a number of distinguished men in the scientific world. The famous experiment upon the fertilized ovum of the frog is still fresh in the memory of everyone interested in the question. Professor Roux, of Breslau, celebrated for his extraordinary skill in biological research, carefully watched the development of a fertilized frog's egg; as soon as the first cleavage had made its appearance he killed, by means of a hot pin, one of the two cells, stating that the result would be a onesided tadpole, because the chromosomes of the other side had been extinguished. His prediction came true, only one half of the tadpole developed. However, Roux did not go far enough, some one else continued the experiment and, in due season, the other half of the tadpole appeared, proving conclusively that the chromosomes of the cells are by no means predestined to form only one or the other particular organ or even layer of the body, but that their destiny is entirely dependent upon the conditions of the environment and the interrelation of the cells. All that we can affirm, therefore, is that chromosomes are the active agents in the process of development and that their character is universal, specific differentiations being due to epigenetic influences. At every moment in the life of an organism the impelling force is active a millionfold, controlling the individual in every nerve and fiber of its being, while the chromosomes of the mature reproductive cells receive this enormous power in a concentrated form potentially unmeasurable. And just as the single cell, though differentiated towards a particular function and form, always exhibits all the other functions of organic life, its differentiations depending upon them, so the individual man, though differentiated from other organisms, inherits all the qualities of differentiated individualism that has preceded him.

Some one might say, this is rank materialism, and has nothing to do with the ethical question which you propose to discuss. For nature there is no good and evil. It is argued that intention only awakes with consciousness, that while the animal is capable of distinguishing between pain and pleasure, it cannot dis-

tinguish between these as the result of its own action in distinction from that of nature outside itself. Only the self-consciousness of the human being knows good and evil; nature does not know evil, for she does not know the opposite on which it is based. I grant that only partially, for, as I said above, there is always a physical function connected with the psychical which is not variable but constant and the so-called freedom of the will cannot interfere with the constancy of nature; besides, I deal here only with facts on which ethical theory may be based, not with such theory itself. In order to understand life we must appeal to the simplest form of existence in which life manifests itself. That which the finite mind can reasonably grasp in any sphere of knowledge is primarily the simple and undifferentiated. Chemical analysis with its marvellous revelations dates from the discovery of the molecular structure of matter and the establishment of the atomic theory; understand the nature of an atom and you understand chemical reactions. Thus, likewise, the analysis of vital phenomena, in its broadest sense, becomes a possibility when we reach a clear understanding of the simplest factors in the manifestations of life as such. Anatomy, psychology and ethics become intelligible only when studied from a comparative point of view. In order to appreciate the extremely complex forms of good and evil manifest in the most civilized human society, we must know something of the condition of the savage and something of the former savage condition of society. Again, in order to properly deal with the savage, we must acknowledge that the physical is by far the most predominant in his composition, and, for the intelligent appreciation of vital physical manifestations, we must go to the simplest organism capable of independent actions. I do not forget, however, that the reverse is likewise true, viz., that the existence of the simple finds its true interpretation only in the light of the complex; the root of the plant finds its true interpretation in the flower and fruit, for which it exists, but both flower and fruit have their ground in root and stem and leaf; no matter how beautiful and complex the flower and fruit are, they are ultimately nothing but modified leaves.

There is nowhere in nature a development from the complex to the simple, but always the reverse. The same holds good in the moral sphere. The consciousness of self did not appear all at once and full fledged as did Minerva from the head of Jupiter; the ethical does not begin with the human being known to us by natural history; there are still races of men which stand lower than many species of animals; and the early development of moral activity was of necessity much more of the nature of that which we call evil than that which we call good. Palæontology points to a severe struggle for existence throughout prehistoric times. The argument that we know as a matter of fact that painful or pleasurable excitation makes itself felt before it is connected in consciousness with any distinct object becomes fallacious, since we know nothing at all of the beginning of consciousness, but only its variation, and cannot, therefore, pronounce dogmatically on the absence of consciousness in the cases of organisms differing from our own, or even in the case of inorganic matter. If we carry our considerations in a spirit not prejudiced by a human-interested bias of observation, beyond the province of life we may, like Du Prel and others, arrive at a theory of intelligence as a universal property of matter, this would not be in opposition to the most orthodox dictum of progressive revelation. For we lay ourselves open to the accusation of gross materialism, if we begin with inorganic matter and assume automatism to be the cause of its motion, interpreting much of the function of organic existence as due to material action and reaction. But, if we assume that in the great cycle of creative development, the divine life and energy, which God first involved into the lowest conditions, is at length, through a series of forward movements gathered, organized and individuated, does it not seem logical to maintain that the marvellous tendency of all systems of material parts towards harmony must be due to the same causes as those to which we ascribe action towards an end, action that involves self-preservation in the broadest sense of the word in man? May not the heavenly bodies, learning from experience in some way, as man does, gradually come to choose, though still in accordance

with natural laws (as man also invariably chooses), that orbit which preserves them from collision? "Why may we not equally well suppose," says Williams, "merely a difference in the direction of consciousness corresponding to differing organization and function in the one case and differing composition or constitution and corresponding motion in the other?" What we call "blind instinct" or automatism may in reality be consciousness, the difficulty with us is that we cannot discern the end involved for the organism performing the act. When we, therefore, speak of the material basis of inheritance in man, we must assume that the nuclear chromosomes, however infinitesimal, involve in their transmission, likewise, the sum total of the growth in progressive consciousness, all that had been active in root, stem and leaf of the great world-tree, millions of years before him and capable of further developments within him. Genesis itself is proof that consciousness of self was not born with man. The Eden of the Bible does not present spiritual or even intellectual perfection, but only that which is sensuous; it represents the ripeness and perfection of a great kingdom, the climax of the physical development of man; there was, as yet, neither moral nor spiritual law to be observed or violated. Only gradually the God-voice in man became audible and the throes and birth-pangs of a new kingdom began; the adaptation to a new environment, no longer purely physical but moral and spiritual, inaugurated a struggle much severer than the world had hitherto witnessed. The purely organic consciousness—sometimes called instinct—so powerful by an inheritance of an untold number of years, began its warfare against a new response to environment, called human reason, infantile and tottering in its beginning, and the result could only be a constant stumbling and falling, however not downward, but "upward" as Henry Wood has suggested. "Man forever lost his sense of completeness in animal development and a rational and spiritual restlessness possessed him. There was no more Eden. The flaming sword was the evolutionary bar which unceasingly interdicted a return to perfect sensuous repose and satisfaction. The rational and moral nature passed from latency to activity.

Gestation was ended, the umbilical cord severed, and man was cast out to begin at the very foundation to build a new consciousness and project a higher kingdom. The moral freedom of choice and of possible voluntary character came to light. The mistakes connected with infantile and ignorant choosing are typified by thousand thistles, toils and sweat. The perfect delight of Eden was missing and this, to the childish stage of human consciousness, seemed like a great loss—a fall." These words of Mr. Henry Wood in the May number of the *Arena* of 1895, pp. 364-365 are still applicable in the present condition of the human race; the fundamentals of inheritance are still the same, in spite of untold modifications produced by change of environment. A child of civilized parents of a higher type of morality, if carried off in infancy by savages, will fail to exhibit the high character of its parents, to the same degree as it is possible that it would fail to exhibit their higher intellectual gifts. It can only be reasonably expected that the child would show a certain mental acuteness applied to savage affairs and some greater degree of human feeling, demonstrated, however, by savage conception. No inheritance can ever be more than this, the fundamental tendencies inherited from life as such will under any circumstance assert themselves most potently. Organic inheritance then furnishes an explanation of the primary character of evil. Think for a moment of the unnumbered forces predominant in the chromosomes of the mature reproductive cells and "the lust of the flesh" finds an explanation; the horrible forms of this particular evil predominant in all classes of society, and more potent in its results for the race than any other form, are the consequences of the unlimited exertion of forces perfectly normal. Or, picture to yourself the ever growing tendency of ordinary somatic cells towards multiplication dependent upon the constant supply of food, chromosomes at work in epidermal cells, in muscular cells, in digestive cells, in excretory cells, in nerve cells, in brain cells, and the "pride of the eye" with all its variations of greed and selfishness finds its proper interpretation. Beyond these two forms of evil, viz.: sexual corruption, the physico-moral evil and greed of selfishness our ethical discussions never advance.

Evil, therefore, in the primary sense, has its origin in the fundamental constitution and function of life as such. Just as the energy of the engine depends upon the constant supply of fuel, so does organic energy upon the constant supply of food. The difference between the motion of inorganic masses and that of organic is, however, far reaching; the former is external, the latter internal, an internal energy capable of overcoming all resisting natural forces. This internal energy rests upon a mechanical displacement of molecules, produced by a stimulus. But between stimulus and motion there intervenes a certain peculiar something called sensation. It transmits the stimulus to the organ which sets the latter free and produces thus, at the same time, impulses for action—capable of setting stimuli free. Primarily, the sensation centers in the acquirement of food for purposes of self-preservation and growth. Growth by means of intussusception depends upon another primitive process, viz., that of exchange of food and waste-matter by means of diffusion, generally called metabolism. We witness here the manifestation of the most powerful function of an elementary organism, the first heritage in the organic kingdom. The elementary organism is capable of absorbing as much food as the circumstances permit. We know practically nothing of the limit of the resorptive capacity of an organism under the most favorable circumstances; as a matter of fact, however, it has been found to be enormous under peculiarly favorable conditions. The lower animals are constantly eating, and among plants this tendency is still more frequent. Experiments with electric, violet and super-violet light have produced enormous growth in plants, causing an excessive acceleration of metabolism and assimilation. The same results of hypertrophy are reached by a change of temperature. A slight increase in the temperature of an incubator will produce a monstrous increase of those organs of the chick, which at that time undergo their chief development. Exactly the same effect is obtained with aquatic plants and animals when density and temperature of the water change. In an extended series of experiments with oysters, I succeeded in producing the most wonderful changes in the circula-

tion of the blood as well as in the color of the animal. All these facts prove that the organic cells possess a much larger resorptive power than they are capable of developing under normal conditions. We may, therefore, affirm that the cell is capable of satisfying every demand which nature makes under normal conditions; and, since the reception of the largest possible quantity lies, under given conditions, beyond the controlling power of the creature, the latter is practically insatiable. This insatiability thus appears as a normal property of cell-life, as a permanent tendency towards an increase of its income. The same phenomenon is observed in the inorganic world: chemical reaction takes place along the line of greatest heat development, the tendency being always towards strongest and most complete saturation, a fact which throws considerable light upon the inter-relation between the vital and the purely chemical functions of the protoplasm. This insatiability of organized protoplasm has been called by Ralph mechanical hunger in contradistinction from the psychic hunger which is based upon the former. The chief concern in the economy of nature is therefore not merely the replacement of loss, but the increase of income, of metabolic substances, so that the measure of growth depends upon the intensity of metabolism. This again depends upon a corresponding condition in the environment, especially that of light and heat. The creature which can maintain itself in continued sunlight has better chances to reach the maximum of saturation, chemically as well as physiologically, than the one which is exposed to the negative influences of darkness. Light and darkness change every twelve hours. An organism born during the period of light will lose in intensity of metabolic power during the period of darkness, one born in darkness will gain in light, decreasing again during darkness. Decrease of metabolic power means decrease of nourishment, *i. e.*, hunger, and hunger creates pain. The natural tendency of such organisms would, therefore, be to escape the condition of hunger; its first movements will be those of flight. The restlessness of spores, *e. g.*, in the dark is due to a want of food, *i. e.*, hunger. They seek with feverish excitement the light, with-

out which assimilation cannot take place with sufficient energy to keep them alive, much less to permit reproduction by division. The same is true of organisms born in darkness, that increases metabolic powers; a change from darkness to sunlight will increase the capacity as well as the demand for assimilation, *i. e.* hunger will become more intense in spite of increased assimilation. The need for assimilation, or hunger, is therefore independent upon the quantity of food-supply but upon other conditions, especially light and temperature. Rapid assimilation, therefore, creates a much more intense hunger than slow assimilation. All these phenomena are absolutely normal and God-given. They are common to all cells and cell-life as such; they condition the rise of multicellular beings and determine even the differentiation of sex; they are controlled by the hereditary factors and in turn control the hereditary factors.

Hunger, then, is the central factor in our problem. Around it cluster, as it were, the strongest tendencies for self-preservation or the evasion of pain; by it egotistic qualities are developed, inherited and transmitted, and with it comes the power of choice. It is, therefore, a factor in progressive revelation as well as in progressive inheritance. No matter what the freedom of the will in the metaphysical sense may be, such freedom cannot interfere with this constancy of natural law. Pain then is primarily not the result of guilt, but simply the inability to satisfy normal demands. Man's early existence as an individual is distinguished by the length of duration of a condition of helplessness, at the beginning of which, beyond the fundamental so-called organic actions, only a few simple activities manifest themselves. The fundamental actions will make themselves felt under any condition, in other respects the child is born with almost everything to acquire. As reason slowly unfolds itself, the child becomes peculiarly susceptible to the nature of its surroundings and the early tendencies are generally under the influence of the fundamental so-called organic actions; they will remain so if the environment remains primitive, reason will become operative solely in the direction of the satisfaction of the appetites. "Conscience," says

Burton, "does not exist in eastern Africa" and "repentance" expresses regret for missed opportunities of mortal crime. "Robbery constitutes an honorable man; murder—the more atrocious the midnight crime the better—makes the hero." Evil thus grows out of the normal property of organic inheritance, viz., insatiability, which had reigned supreme in the organic world long before man appeared on the scene, which had led to the intense struggle for existence, and spread torture, agony and death. It is significant that Genesis represents the cause of the "fall of man" under the image of a craving for food. "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruits thereof and did eat and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." Here we have, as it were, a supersaturation of organic activity, a reaching out beyond the confines of the original environment and with it the necessity of pain and of readjustment. Revelation progresses one step further and brings experience, and with experience knowledge of good and evil. Thus the stumbling and falling gradually lifts man on a higher plane or on a higher environment. The fundamental organic inheritance becomes, under new conditions, the stimulus for the constant exercises of higher powers. The thorns and thistles are found to be not "evil" but only unripened and undeveloped good. "Edenic products come spontaneously, but after falling upward, man—now real man—forms under the constant guidance of progressive revelation for himself." He has become as "a god," says Mr. Wood. In all our struggles against evil, especially in all our educational efforts, the prime necessity is the creation of more perfect environment and here again the fundamental organic inheritance has to be taken into consideration. We have to begin with the physical training of children, and here the prime question ought to be: what is the ultimate ability of the respective organs of a child at various periods, how much can we expect from them, how can we aid and develop them towards a stage of perfect health *i. e.*, perfect ability? On it depends not only the ability to cope with circumstances, but

also the moral power of cheerfulness. This ultimate ability or endurance depends in any case upon the number of accessible normal cells of the peripheral organs and of the nervous system. However, the mere external exhibition of ability is in the case of children not by any means the absolute criterion for the sum total of living forces within the human organisms. On careful investigation it has been ascertained that the body resists diseases most successfully during the childhood period from the seventh to the fifteenth year. Physiology teaches that during this time the metabolic changes are much greater than during any subsequent epoch and the chromosomatic changes are extraordinarily intense. The general mortality is very small, consumption is entirely retarded, great epidemics attack only a very minute percentage of the children of that age; scarlet and typhoid fever occur only in a mild form. But with the approach of sexual maturity, and largely through it, the vital energies begin to decrease in the other organs and death begins to lay its hold upon the human form. During the years of childhood therefore the process of internal growth consumes so great an energy that the sum total of all the forces of the bodily organs is larger than ever afterwards in adult life. It is during these years that the material basis of inheritance assumes its final form and function in the chromosomes of the ripening reproductive cells. It is during these years that impressions are deposited which are more probably transmitted than those in later life. Thus it becomes the supreme duty of parents and children to lay the proper foundation for the future happiness of their children; physically by a careful development and nourishment of the organs of the body, morally by properly guiding the innate tendencies towards insatiability and selfishness.

In touching upon the highest stage of progressive revelation, *i. e.*, the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, we must reverently refer to the significance which the birth of Jesus has for our discussion. If the material basis of inheritance is contained in the fertilized ovum, and if this partakes of the character of organic nature in its universal manifestations, developing in conformity

with the environment, we reach the conclusion that the creation of a new spiritual environment necessitated the introduction of a new principle in the original process, viz., "the conception by the Holy Spirit." It is only in perfect correspondence with this new spiritual environment, *i. e.*, in communion with the divine master that the fundamental organic egotism is lifted up and transformed into the manifestation of absolute unselfish love of God and love of man. Does not our Lord himself constantly testify to this fact? "Man does not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." A new environment, a new food, a change in the direction of insatiability, a new factor of internal and external correspondence, a new basis of inheritance by communion and transmission with and from above, a new light shed upon the significance of all organic existence—all with and in Jesus Christ. If man is to be partaker of divine inheritance he must be heir to all that is included in the divine from the atom to the Spirit—and the Problem of Evil finds its explanation and its solution.

II.

SOCIAL EVILS AND THEIR REMEDY.

BY REV. S. Z. BEAM, D.D.

In attempting to cure the evils of society, it ought not to be forgotten that society like the poet, *is born, not made*. It has become what it is, not by mathematical addition, but by organic growth. It is composed, not like a sand heap, of an innumerable multitude of particles having no sort of relation to each other, but of living persons animated by a common life. The radical principle of society is found in the family, which rests in that mysterious but essential and reciprocal relation which exists between husband and wife. The male and female principles, in their conjugal relation, form the whole ground work of the social organism, and out of this sacred relation has grown the social system, of which every individual forms a legitimate and essential part. "The idea of man which is of course originally one and single, in order that it may become actual, must resolve itself into an innumerable multitude of individual lives, whose perfection subsequently can be found again in no other form than that of their general union in a free way."* This solidarity of the race makes their interests mutual, so that the elimination of evil must be for the good of all.

The human body is an individual organism, of which even the smallest member is a natural necessity, and the organism is imperfect if any member is missing; and it suffers if any member suffers. So the body politic, the nation, or society in general, is a living organism, the outgrowth and extension of the family; and the individual personalities are its organs. The "Social Compact," in which the individuals to the contract waive certain rights, for the interests of all, may suffice for business purposes. But it is a mechanical contrivance, which by no means answers

*Dr. Nevins's Moral order of Sex. Mer. Rev. Vol. 2, page 551.

to the true idea of society. A contract may be broken, or made subservient to the interests of one party, and detrimental to those of another. Whenever that idea prevails, the interests of all are not conserved. The majority are held in subjection by the few, so that the principle underlying it proves to be both shallow and vicious. It is not the true principle underlying either the state or the social organism, in general. But both state and society are of divine ordination and depend not on human contract. A violation of our relation to either can not therefore better our condition, but always makes it worse. And therefore all efforts for reforming society, which ignore its organic nature, must be calamitous to all.

Another thing to be recognized and reckoned with, is the fact of sin, that foreign element in the human heart, out of which grow all the evils which afflict us. No remedy, which does not provide for the eradication of this root of all evil, can effect a cure. All intelligent physicians know that a correct diagnosis in any case of disease, must be obtained before they can hope to effect a cure. They can administer an anodyne, a sedative, or a palliative, but, unless they find a remedy, the patient is deceived, and may be left in a far worse condition than he was before. The palliative furnishes a temporary relief, and lulls the patient into a false hope, unless it is followed by an application of the effectual remedy. This same principle applies to the diseases of society. And it is sad to contemplate the quackery of so-called reformers, whose remedies afford, perhaps temporary relief, but ultimately result in disastrous failure, because the diagnosis of the case was false. An example of this kind of doctoring is furnished in the reforms of Jean Jacques Rousseau, in the eighteenth century. He was a man of bad private character, but also a philanthropic philosopher. He undertook the reformation of society in France. His views, advanced with extraordinary enthusiasm and eloquence, were kindly received in all parts of Europe, and many of the best minds fell in with his theory, which, for a time, seemed to promise relief. Assuming the "essential goodness of human nature," he relied on education chiefly

for its improvement. And while avowed infidels were undermining the foundations of society, many good people embraced Rousseau's ideas with the hope of preventing its fall, or aiding in its reconstruction. But the sad history of the eighteenth century, with its overthrow of society in France, shows the futility of his efforts. We can not enter into details. But the Revolution, caused by the inequality of privileges among all classes, and the oppression of the poor, was rather helped than hindered by his measures. Education is power for evil, as well as for good. In this case it worked evil. The efforts at reform took a stand against the Church, and, however well meant, they were conducted in an irreligious way. They indeed recognized the equality of all men, and promised a golden age and a better condition for all. With such false promises a ferment was raised, which burst forth in the complete overthrow of State and Society, the setting up of the goddess of reason in the person of a misguided woman, and "the reign of terror," the contemplation of which makes the blood run cold in one's veins.

Another such failure is that of Robert Owen in England. This man spent a great fortune in bettering the condition of his own laborers, and in attempting to reform and elevate their social condition. He established schools for the poor, and for orphans and outcast children. This was laudable and, doubtless, many received great benefits from his philanthropy. But, unfortunately for the character of his measures, he assaulted the religion of Christ, and sought to destroy the most sacred institutions of society, including the sanctity of the marriage relation; and treated the Bible doctrine of the future state as a delusion. As a natural consequence, his communistic society came to grief, just as all such ill-conceived efforts have failed in the past, and must fail in the future. Now it is evident in these, and all similar instances, that the true nature of society was misunderstood, and that the real cause of its evils was entirely overlooked. All that these reformers have seen was on the surface of society, and, not comprehending its organic nature, or penetrating to the heart of society, whose corruption was the poisonous source of all the

troubles, their efforts, even in their best results, amounted to a mere whitewashing of the outer crust, while the inward corruption continued to fester and pollute the whole organism. They tried to heal the streams without purifying the fountain.

The abnormal condition of society has been manifested in all ages, and history furnishes examples in every age, of persons attempting to rectify, or remove its ills. But, like the efforts just described, they have all ended in failure, because neither the true nature of man, nor the true need of society was understood. The disease was in the heart. From this corrupt source flow all the streams of sin and sorrow and suffering which afflict the whole social body. No treatment, therefore, can heal the streams, that does not purify the fountain. This implies, of course, that *regeneration* is the only panacea. But regeneration can affect society as a whole, only as it renews the hearts and purifies the lives of individuals, who, through their vital relation to the family, constitute the general organism. As the imperfections of human nature are felt in all universally, the evils of society, as a whole, can disappear eventually only as they are removed from all. That this end can not be reached by mere external educational means, history is a standing witness.

That the remedy for social evils can not be furnished by law, is equally demonstrated by the history of the nations. The cry for class legislation raises a demand which cannot be supplied. All laws are more or less partial in their application, helping some and injuring others. Laws are not, and can not be, specific enough to regulate all the actions of men. The very best of them are often evaded, or nullified by men who profit by injuring others. The divine law itself was not sufficient to put away sin, or to relieve the sorrows of suffering men. Such is the declaration of inspiration, which is fully demonstrated and sustained by all human experience. The nearest approach to a perfect legal code, for the regulation of human actions, known to us, is furnished by the laws of Moses. These were indeed imperfect, though of divine origin, simply because, as Jesus explained, they had to be adapted to the imperfect moral and religious state of

the people for whose government they were enacted.* Still, if the Jews had kept these laws, they might have been the happiest people in all the earth. They taught the equality of men. They required every man to treat every other as a brother, and not to oppress the widow and orphan, or grind the faces of the poor. These laws were just and righteous, regulating the moral conduct, and making every one feel that he was responsible for the happiness and welfare of his fellows. They permitted slavery and divorce indeed, but the hardship of slavery was mitigated by requiring the master to treat the slave as his own child—while no man could divorce his wife without an adequate cause, which was named and limited by the law itself. A master could command the service of the slave, but it must not be hard service, and must be rewarded, and, after a certain time, at the year of Jubilee he must be manumitted, and sent out into freedom, not empty handed, but with a portion sufficient to start in business for himself. These laws provided also that property, taken for debt, must not be alienated forever, but must be restored to the original owner or his heirs, in the year of Jubilee. This was a sort of Socialism which respected the equality and privileges of all. But these beneficent laws were violated continually, and so the people nullified their otherwise salutary effects by incurring their penalty. And at last, when, through perversity, that people had defeated the good intent of their laws, they were discontented with their divine King, and demanded a human king, under the delusion that a royal government would improve their condition. They desired to be like other peoples. But they soon found that their kings trampled on the laws, and they suffered worse evils than before.

The situation was no better, but rather worse among the other most cultivated peoples of the ancient world. Greece, in many respects, was the most glorious of countries. The Greeks were the teachers of the world in science and the fine arts. Aristotle rules, even to this day, a great part of the world's thinking. The æsthetic beauty of Greek sculpture and painting are still unsur-

*Matt. 19: 8.

passed. Their law givers rank among the wise men of the earth, while their philosophy and language are studied and admired in all our institutions of learning. When now we add to all these advantages, the natural beauty of Hellas, together with its glorious climate, we might be led to think that, in Greece if anywhere, the evils of society were overcome, and that the people enjoyed the maximum of happiness. But, in fact, all these advantages were nullified by tyranny and oppression. There were citizen and slaves—more slaves than citizens—and neither were happy. Those who had high privileges abused them, and turned their noblest blessings into a curse. The slaves were oppressed, often to the verge of rebellion, so that the best of men were unhappy in the fear of violent death. In Greece the state was everything, the man nothing, only as he was useful to the state. The highest officers, from the tyrant down to the petty clerk, were constantly subjected to the danger of deposition, disgrace, confiscation or death, for the most trivial offences or mistakes. A soldier, who permitted himself to be taken prisoner, was a disgrace to his nation and his family, and was disowned by both, if, indeed, he was not put to death as a common criminal. A victor in the Olympic or the Isthmian games was as highly honored as the captain who saved his country from its enemies. The noblest lawgivers, the wisest statesmen, and the greatest teachers were subject to the whims of an irresponsible multitude who might, at any moment, for any cause, or no cause, vote for his destruction (*e. g.*, Socrates). The laws of Greece were no bar against the evils of society. The rich might oppress the poor. But the rich themselves were in bondage by the fear of violence, so that the fair and sunny Greece, with all its natural and acquired advantages, suffered all the evils of social corruption and vice.

Again, a similar state of affairs confronts us in the Roman Empire. A Roman might sometimes save himself from a disgraceful death by crying, "*Romanus civis sum.*" The Romans are the accredited lawgivers of the ancient world. Rome sat mistress of the ancient world on her seven hills and, in her wisdom, developed the principles of common law, and dispensed

them to the provinces. And so excellent were her laws, that many of our modern statutes are modelled after those of Rome. But under her laws many amassed immense fortunes, and lived and revelled in luxury and effeminacy, and the emperors rolled in wealth and fattened on delicacies imported from her remotest provinces, and from distant India and Cathay, while poverty wallowed in the streets of Rome or people starved on the Palatine Hill.

Under the later emperors we discover some evidences of improvement among the masses, which we trace to the ameliorating influence of Christianity, which was already making itself felt for good, notwithstanding the resistance of law, literature and heathenism. The combined antagonism of these adverse powers it had to meet in deadly conflict, but it met them successfully. Gibbon, the inimitable historian of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, in seeking for the cause of this improvement, affects to find it in the virtue or policy of the emperors, in the self interest of the masters, and in the habits of education. But, in his search, he ignores the presence and influence of Christianity, though in other passages of his history, he is constrained to acknowledge its power in elevating the morals of the people.

These three things, in his judgment, contributed to the alleviation of the hardship of servitude. But he neglects to say, what his own history of the times seems to prove, that these causes themselves owe their existence, in a large degree, to the benign teaching and example of the religion of Christ. But he declares that there is great reason for the belief, that before the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, the faith of Christ had been preached in all the provinces and cities of the Roman Empire. And since, according to his own account, the social improvement of the poor and of slaves, began after the introduction of that religion into the empire, he furnishes us a good reason to believe that the improvement was due in large measure to the progress of Christianity. The advancement, of course, was slow, but we may well suppose that it was retarded, not by any weakness inherent in the faith or the methods of its adherents, but, rather, by the bitter

opposition of its enemies, which it was compelled to encounter from every quarter.

That classic heathenism contributed nothing to this elevating influence, is apparent from the well established fact, that, when Christianity began its conquests, the religion of the old world had already reached its highest development, without elevating the masses, and was now falling into decay. Human nature, with all the advantages of power, wealth and glory, had proved itself incapable of rising above its helpless misery, and a night of despair was casting its dreary shades over a well-nigh hopeless world. All the resources of law, of science, and of a man-made religion had been exhausted, and the civilization of the age was sinking into a state of moral decrepitude, which unassisted human nature had no recuperative power to overcome. The religion of heathenism with the poetic beauty of its mythology, and its multitudinous pantheon of divinities had left its golden age in the irredeemable past; and it had no new-creative energy, and no regenerative principle, to bring back the golden age, or to elevate mankind to the mastery of sin. Hence vice ran riot, and was unrestrained. Misery and wretchedness oppressed the poor, and even the rich and powerful were hopelessly floundering in the "slough of despond," or weltering in their blood. Religion could no longer afford comfort, because of its own moral decay. It had become a tool in the hands of a venal priesthood, with which to grind the faces of the poor and to bleed the rich, while all classes of society were wallowing in the mire of moral corruption, and intellectual debauchery. The laws of Rome, born of her highest civilization, were powerless to destroy the evils of society, to heal the cancer which fed on its vitals, or even to mitigate any longer the wretchedness of a social organism, perishing under the crushing weight of its own iniquities. But, happily, at this juncture in the tide of human affairs, when men were helplessly crying for deliverance, the God of infinite love, not desiring the destruction of men, but yearning after their salvation, revealed a religion which was capable of liberating them from the fetters of a false religion, from the dominion of sin, and from the

condemnation of irreligion, and from the consequent corruption and misery which they were suffering. In the theanthropic person of His Son, Jesus Christ, He revealed, and in His religion, unfolded, in the midst of the world's decrepitude and decay, a regenerative energy, which was able to mortify the old sinful nature of man, to quicken him with a new divine life, and to restore harmony and love and good will among men.

These salutary effects were not accomplished in a moment, or without a struggle. The regenerative principle, though conceived in the womb of humanity, which was overshadowed by the divine Spirit, had to struggle to its birth in the lives of individuals, through faith, bringing them into living union with Christ in the Church. And so it is destined to work its way till the whole social organism becomes animated with the new divine life, and is led in the way of peace and happiness.

How grandly did the few disciples of Jesus, impelled with the energy of this new life, with no weapon but the sword of the Spirit which is the word of God, win victory after victory for the kingdom of Christ, until at last His religion ascended the throne of the Cæsars, and extended its saving health among the nations! And in all succeeding ages it has continued to spread, and ameliorate the condition of men wherever it has been believed and embraced, until this present day. And, deny who may, we confidently affirm that this blessed religion, though confronted with bitter opposition in every conceivable form, is gradually transforming society, overcoming its evils, and bringing happiness to all who honestly embrace its overtures of mercy, and obey its heavenly precepts. He who can not see its salutary influence on the society that is pervaded by its life and Spirit, must read history with eyes closed, or mind prejudiced against the truth. He who thus reads history, without discovering the fact and effects of the religion of Christ, running like a stream of light and glory through the ages, loses the most salutary lessons which it teaches.

And yet, in the face of these inestimable facts and effects of this divine regenerative energy, we must witness the melancholy

spectacle of reformers ignoring the religion of Christ, reproaching His church, and, like reformers of an earlier day, appealing to the passions of men, creating dissensions, and exciting them to revolt against society, with the vain hope of improving their condition on the basis of heathenism. The socialism thus based on falsehood, and led by infidel principles, must always, in the future, as it has done in the past, result in the degradation of society, and multiply the evils it seeks to destroy. Communism, socialism, coöperative trade and labor unionism, however antagonistic among themselves, all appear to agree in ignoring, or condemning the Church of Christ. They leave God out of the account, and, as a necessary consequence, we find them floundering in the mire of naturalism, irreligion and immorality. They see only the worse side of the social system. They seek diligently amid the garbage of human decay for its rottenness, and in this they revel and rollic, with no eye and no taste for the pure and holy.

They look upon mankind as a host of separate units struggling for existence and pleasure. They see the strong prevail and the weak go down. For all who succeed they have only words of censure, as if success deserved punishment. Failure they call misfortune for which the successful must be held responsible. Those who fail are held as innocent and oppressed. Their self-constituted friends industriously sow seeds of dissatisfaction, array the poor against the rich, arouse the spirit of rebellion, and, failing to gain their ends by warlike words, they proceed to enforce their arguments with flames and blood. Losses are thus suffered on both sides, in time and wages, on one side, in property on the other; and the breach between capital and labor is widened.

Many of the rich undoubtedly oppress the poor for selfish purposes; but justice requires that all should have their due. Sin is at the root of all the ills of life, and failure is often the penalty of sin, while success ultimately becomes equally disastrous to those who succeed by trickery and fraud. The guilty rich are walking in slippery places, and many have paid the penalty by falling into poverty. Knowing, therefore, the evil propensities of human nature in all, the aim of all reformers should be the recon-

ciliation of the antagonists. All know that the interests of the employer, and the employee are mutual. And mutual understanding of this relation, by which each will consider the best interests of both, will improve the condition of all. But such reconciliation and mutual understanding can only be secured through the mediation of Him who was born to be the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, in whom is embodied personally the energy of a new creation. The life-giving power of His Holy Spirit, active in the "sacramental energies" of the Church, must be permitted to regenerate, and elevate society into the sphere of grace, before the needful reforms can be effected. For in Christ alone, through whom we have the atonement, can men be reconciled to God and to one another; because in Him alone resides the power, which is able to destroy the evils that afflict mankind.

But those who neglect the Church and the means of grace, some of whom in a patronizing way admire the example of Christ, never rise above the sphere of nature, and their plans of reformation are destined to failure. God can not help men who attempt to elevate themselves independently of the means which He has provided for their use, but, as of old, He permits them to go in their own ways, which always end in disaster and ruin.

There is, of course, a better side to human nature, and because there is, it is possible to renew and save it, by bringing it sacramentally into living union with the life of Christ. But this life is supernatural and spiritual, and is from above. But many of the reforms of the present day are purely natural and not spiritual. They are agnostic, not scientific. They are full of zeal, but without knowledge. They are blind to the ameliorating influence of the Gospel. They pay more heed to the groans of pessimistic philosophers than to the inspiring optimism of the Gospel. And, hence, they fail to see that the condition of men in Christian lands is *growing better—not worse*. Suffering, sorrow and oppression, it must be admitted, do prevail to an alarming extent, and yet in the interest of truth, it must be asserted, that this age surpasses all preceding ages in everything that

contributes to the comfort and happiness of all classes of society. And, while poverty and oppression do afflict the many, it is not true that all the rich grind the faces of the poor, and that all the poor are oppressed and unhappy. Neither is it universally true that the rich are growing richer and the poor growing poorer. Leaving out of view the slums, and "down town tenements" of the large cities, and some public works where strikes are carried on as part of the trade, we find the poor of to-day better fed, better clothed, and better sheltered than at any former period in the world's history. And besides, Christian philanthropy is doing more for the relief and elevation of those in extreme poverty than ever before, and a large number receive its benefits. So that we feel justified in the affirmation that to the same extent the people are happier.

These statements, it must be admitted, are in conflict with the views of many intelligent people. But a fair comparison of the present state of society with that of any previous period, will abundantly sustain the position here taken. The difficulty with many good people is that they close their eyes to everything but the evils that afflict society; and in the continued contemplation of the worst side of life, they have come to believe that all the evils which ever tormented mankind have been concentrated and focussed on this wicked and suffering age, while all the good has either passed away or is yet to come. On the contrary, while we see the evils, we rejoice also to contemplate the other side of human life, which by its present progress in better things, inspires hope for the future.

This better state of society will be found on honest inquiry, to have its origin and support in the regenerative and elevating power of the religion of Christ, as this is mediated to men through the instrumentality of His Church.

And on the other hand it will be found, that, with few exceptions, the most miserable and wretched are those who despise and reject the church of Christ, are strangers to the covenant of grace, and refuse the kind offices of our holy religion. The rich and the poor alike, who cut themselves off from the blessings of

religion, are fighting their battles on the plane of nature alone, where God allows them to destroy each other. So it ever has been, so it ever will be. The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.

And yet God is infinitely merciful, ever ready and anxious to help the poor and needy, if they will come to Him for help, or if they will let His blessings come upon them, without laying the obstructions of unbelief in the way. He is the common Father of us all, and we are brethren. And God desires us to recognize the relationship. To this end He revealed Himself in Christ, that the race might be united in Him, as their common Savior and elder brother, and that under the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit, the moral darkness and evils which oppress society might disappear. Let Christianity thus have its perfect work, and we feel sure that every one then, under the guidance of this spirit, will compete with every other in spreading the Gospel of Christ, and for the complete emancipation of the social organism from the evils and oppressions that have so long afflicted it.

III.

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.

BY JOSEPH HENRY DUBBS, D.D.

In our studies of the great religious movement of the sixteenth century our attention is apt to be confined to a single phase of that stupendous theme. Our Protestant faith and Teutonic blood lead us to ignore its Romanic elements. We forget that, though in its earlier stages, the Reformation was a German protest against the corruptions of Rome, the time arrived when Rome herself was forced by the logic of events to recognize the reformers in her own communion, and thus to institute a *quasi* Reformation of her own.

Before the middle of the sixteenth century Protestantism had in a great degree accomplished the work which it had set out to perform. It had given the Scriptures to the people; it had taught the world a higher and a purer system of morals; it had, in the language of a recent writer, "successfully renewed the protest of Paul against Peter." However greatly suppressed public opinion may have been in the countries which still adhered to the papacy, there had been an undeniable change of religious sentiment, and neither the clergy nor the laity would have tolerated the election of popes like the Borgias and the worst of the Medicis. The church was in fact ashamed of the flagrant abuses which had led to the great revolt, and was determined that such things should not happen again. It was felt rather than confessed that on the question of morals Protestantism had the best of the argument; that since the empire had departed from Rome she had no occasion to exist as a mere political center; and that if the church of Rome desired to command the respect of the nations she must assert herself as she did at the beginning of the Middle Ages, when Gregory the Great went forth to meet the barbarians and gained their submission by the power of the truth.

It was high time if something was to be done to check the progress of triumphant Protestantism. The Teutonic races were practically alienated from Rome; in Scandinavia the hierarchy itself had renounced its allegiance. Poland and Hungary no longer recognized the authority of the papacy, and in Bohemia the Hussites were more than ever alive. The northern provinces of the Low Countries had become thoroughly Protestant; Austria was preserved only by the personal influence of the emperor; England and Scotland were lost, and France hung in the balance. The only parts of Christendom on which the pope could count with any degree of confidence were the regions occupied by the Romanic races—the great peninsulas, Iberian and Italian—and even there the influence of Protestantism was everywhere apparent. In Portugal the University of Coimbra occupied a decidedly Protestant position; in Spain all the bigotry of Philip II. could not prevent the new doctrines from making their way among the intelligent classes; even in Italy many of the best men were once more advocating a *reformatio in capite et membris*, and Pope Paul III. had gone so far as to give some of these men a place in the college of cardinals. In their desperation the popes had made secular alliances which involved them in war, and having taken up the sword they were in danger of perishing with the sword. It was the emperor's army which, in 1527, sacked Rome; and, it is said, did more to ruin the monuments of antiquity than all the barbarians had done. Philip II., though always ready with torch and faggot, did not hesitate in his secular capacity to wage war against the pope, though his generals were afterwards required to do penance for any disrespect which they had shown to "the Lord's anointed." There can, in fact, be no doubt that before the death of Martin Luther the cause of the Reformation was believed to be practically won. A great empire is, however, never entirely crushed by a single defeat. It possesses resources which do not immediately appear; and when the first humiliation is over there is sure to be a reaction which proves more formidable than earlier attacks. Though the Church of Rome had been beaten in its conflict, it still retained the

allegiance of the Romanic countries. Protestantism, it must be confessed, did not speedily lay hold of the Latin races; it may have been too logical, too didactic, to suit their imaginative natures. The ritual of the mass, elaborated with the artistic skill which had produced the masterpieces of the Italian renaissance, was to them a source of never-ceasing wonder and admiration. The idea of visible unity—the thought of Rome as the ruler of the world—was also fascinating and impressive; they had no conception of the fact that the divisions of Protestantism had been induced by the enthusiasm for the minutest forms of truth which is the crowning test of sincerity. To the ignorant multitudes of Spain and Italy religion was obedience to a spiritual guide; they had no more inclination to study its grounds than the ordinary patient feels to examine the motives of the physician in prescribing for his ailments. Those of higher culture who were inclined to devotion were almost certain to study ascetic ideals. They contemplated the examples of monastic self-sacrifice which the Church presented to their admiration, without appreciating the fact that the time had come for a higher and freer development of Christian life.

The prevalence of such sentiments was due in great measure to the persistent influence of the religious movement which was known as the Cluniac Reform. This movement—which may, of course, be traced to earlier sources—assumed its peculiar characteristics in the eleventh century, at the hands of the monks of the celebrated convent of Clugny, in southeastern France. These monks held to the Benedictine rule, but were very ascetic and laid claim to unusual purity of life. They began their public labors at a time when the church was, in great measure, dependent upon the state; when the emperors assumed the power of appointing bishops, and even of controlling the papacy itself. That the morals of the secular clergy had reached the lowest ebb cannot be doubted.

It was under such circumstances that the abbots of Clugny began to preach the necessity of a reformation, and soon the heads of many other convents joined in the movement which they

had inaugurated. Their ideal of the Christian life was, of course, monastic. Their first purpose was to render the monastic rule more rigorous, and to compel the secular clergy to live after this rule. The marriage of the clergy was denounced as the greatest of crimes, and it was insisted that laymen must be excluded from participation in ecclesiastical matters. Simony was declared to be sacrilege, and the life of the cloister presented as the model of righteous living.

The preaching of the monks of the Clugny led to popular enthusiasm for ascetic ideals. The ideal of the imitation of Christ was as old as Christianity, but it now acquired a new meaning. Christ was to be imitated by a life of voluntary poverty and, especially, by becoming a partaker in his passion. In this way a form of devotion was developed which was not to be satisfied with the service of the church, nor with the ministrations of the parish priest. On hill-tops great crosses were erected, and these consecrated places, which were known as "Calvaries," were approached by multitudes upon their knees. Some of the more enthusiastic devotees even went so far as to endure penances, which only stopped short of death itself. In this way, it may be added, the longing to worship at sacred places was greatly stimulated, and Christendom was prepared to engage in the wars of the Crusades.

Gregory VII., who is better known by his family name of Hildebrand, had been brought up under the influence of the reform of Clugny. He was not an author, nor a great scholar, nor a distinguished theologian; and yet he was in many respects the greatest man of the Middle Ages. A little Tuscan monk, the son of a carpenter, he became at an early age the leading Cluniac reformer, and under five successive popes was the power behind the throne. In A. D. 1073 he was chosen pope, and it was at once felt that a great man was at the helm. His theory, which is generally known as the mediæval theocracy, was in strict accordance with the teachings of Clugny. With his intense conflict with imperialism we have here nothing to do, but it is plain that

he impressed his ideas upon his age, and that for centuries his spirit ruled the thought and devotion of the church.

It may be urged that the establishment of the *Fratres Mendicantes*, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, involved a protest against the exclusiveness of monasticism; but it was rather a means of conveying its ideals to the comprehension of the laity. The friars retained the monastic vows, but they made earnest with them to a degree which had become unusual. Their members were to be really poor, serving as common laborers, and begging only when their necessities absolutely required it. We cannot fail to recognize the self-sacrificing devotion of St. Francis of Assisi, and the profound earnestness of St. Dominic; but it is plain that their ideas of religious life differed in no essential respect from those of the monks of Clugny. The Dominicans and Franciscans were great revival preachers, but they preached the lessons which they had learned in the cloister.

Though the Cluniac reform was proclaimed in all the countries of Christendom, it is plain, we think, that its influence in Germany was not so complete—so all engrossing—as it had proved in Italy. Some of the grounds of this failure are evident at a glance. First we have the long conflict of the papacy with the imperial house of Hohenstauffen, during which many Germans conceived a violent dislike for “Italian machinations.” When Rudolph, of Hapsburg, became emperor, in 1273, he at first made an effort to establish his authority in Rome, but soon became convinced that Germany and Italy had better be separated. He confirmed the pope in the possession of a great part of central Italy, thus securing his gratitude and practically preventing his interference in German politics. From this time the two countries drifted apart, and room was left for the development of different forms of thought and sentiment. In the Church, no less than in the state, men came to occupy different standpoints; and at the hands of such men as Master Eckhardt, Tauler, Thomas á Kempis and Geiler von Kaisersberg, German mysticism assumed a form as far as possible removed from Italian ideals. Savonarola represents a very different form of thought from that which prevailed in Germany.

In Italy the Renaissance had by this time driven the Clunian reform into the background. Especially among the higher classes men cared more for classical antiquity than for the Gospel of Christ. In the year 1300 Dante began to write his "Divine Comedy," and from that year may be dated the beginning of the marvelous movement which revived the study of antiquity, and adorned Italy with cathedrals, libraries and museums. It no doubt accomplished much good in emancipating the mind from the bondage of dogma; but unfortunately it brought with it a revival of heathenism in religion and morality. Some of the so-called Humanists combined culture with religion, but the majority despised Christianity, if they did not actually worship the gods of Greece and Rome. It became fashionable, we are told, to call upon "the immortal gods," and Providence was called *fatum* or *fortuna*. Morality was separated from religion, and men who were prominent in the Church indulged in the most hideous forms of vice. Theological teachers denied the immortality of the soul, and several of the popes publicly sneered at the religious system which they represented.

It is not our purpose to trace the history of the Roman system during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and we have not even room to refer at length to the abortive efforts which were made for its reformation. From what has been said it is easy to discover the material of which Rome rebuilt her desolated kingdom. Humanism was dead; Protestantism she would not accept, and her only apparent resource was to fall back upon the monastic foundation she had lately despised. At first, it would seem, the efforts to suppress Protestantism were not dictated by a settled policy. In some localities avowed Protestants alone were made to suffer, but elsewhere liberal Catholics were treated with equal harshness. To Roman Catholic scholars of the present day it must be a painful subject of reflection that the majority of the sufferers of Spain and Italy were men who had no desire to separate from Rome; that in faith and doctrine they were apparently not further advanced than some of the American bishops of the present day; that, in fact, they were profoundly

sincere in endeavoring to raise the Church to a higher stadium of religious life.

In Italy there was really more religious freedom than in Spain, for the simple reason that there was no political unity. There was no Philip II. and no archbishop of Toledo to carry out his wicked purposes. For a while the pulpits of the great cathedrals of Italy rang with the message of Wittenberg and Geneva, but then came the dark days when Peter Martyr, Ochino, Vergerius and hundreds of others were forced to seek a refuge beyond the Alps.

Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, may be regarded as the leader and chief representative of a movement for a reformation of the Roman church in accordance with mediæval traditions. It was fortunate for Rome that he was too powerful to be crushed. Himself one of the greatest princes of Italy—a nephew of Pope Pius IV.—he was thoroughly devoted to the preservation of the existing order, but could venture to promote reformatory measures to which Rome had hitherto been a stranger. Of his extraordinary mental ability there can be no question, and that, according to the light which he possessed, he manifested earnest piety and devotion will hardly be doubted. In early youth he had been forced by his relatives to enter the priesthood, but he fully appreciated its responsibilities, and though the pope afterwards advised him to be absolved from his vows and to assume his hereditary position he refused to be released. The revenues of his archbishopric, and indeed his private fortune, he devoted to benevolent purposes; he founded hospitals and orphanages, and more than seven hundred schools are said to have been established at his private expense. The opponents of his reforms attempted to assassinate him, but he escaped under circumstances which seemed miraculous. In his diocese were many Protestants, but he was firmly convinced that persecution is the weapon of intellectual weakness, and consequently treated them with great kindness, even setting apart for them a church in Milan, in which the services were conducted in accordance with a simpler ritual than that of Rome. It is

said that "when the Swiss spoke of the wickedness of the Italian clergy they made an exception in favor of Carlo Borromeo." His course may have been dictated by policy, but it was after all a policy that was in accordance with the precepts of the Gospel.

The position held by the modern Roman church in works of general philanthropy is not to be ignored. As the leader of a long line of humanitarians, of whom Philip Neri, Francis of Sales and Vincent of Paul are prominent representatives, Borromeo holds an honorable position in the development of Christian life, but after all the work of this great man would have accomplished little to save Rome from impending ruin if it had not been that a man of greater power was already at work. What seemed to be demanded was a great organizing genius—a born leader of men who united intense enthusiasm with unusual mental acuteness and who would send his agents to distant regions to gather and unite the fragments of the ancient system. He must be a man who combined in his own person the most astonishing antitheses. He must feel the keenest sympathy for the multitudes among whom he labored, full of their superstitions and sharing their prejudices, and yet alive to the necessity of modern methods of discipline and organization; an ascetic and devotee, presenting an undeniable example of that form of self-sacrifice which his age regarded as an infallible test of sincerity, and yet in manners a gentleman who felt at home in the cabinet of kings; a politician more acute than Macchiavelli; a soldier who fought with keener blades than those of Damascus. He must, in fact, be a many-sided man with but a single purpose; a man who by an act of the will had become a "cadaver," a living corpse, a martyr of authority. Such a man the Church had never known, but at the hour of the deepest humiliation he appeared, a man whom his friends have regarded as a new Camillus, another founder of Rome.

Ignatius de Loyola was born in 1491, the youngest son of an obscure Spanish nobleman. He was destined for the profession of arms and his early education was consequently neglected, though he learned to read and write—accomplishments which in

those days were by no means universal. In his boyhood he was a page at the court of King Ferdinand; afterwards he became a soldier and fought bravely against the French at the siege of Pampeluna. In this conflict he was severely wounded, but his chivalrous captors conveyed him to his father's house. The wound healed slowly and he was lamed for life. During his convalescence he read a number of mediæval romances which had been found in a forgotten closet. With intense interest he followed the adventures of the Cid, the hero of Spanish chivalry; rejoiced in the knightly achievements of Amadis of Gaul, or joined in spirit in the disastrous rout:

"When Roland brave and Olivier,
And every Paladin and peer,
At Roncesvalles died."

It was a course of reading not unlike that which Cervantes ascribes to the hero of his great romance, though the knight-errantry which it induced differed greatly from that of the knight of the sorrowful countenance.

When Loyola had read all the romances in the castle he turned to the "Lives of the Saints" and from reading them became fired with religious zeal. Curiously enough, he found that these Lives had a romance of their own which was not less fascinating than tales of war and slaughter. The ideals of self-sacrifice were similar, and in both there was an element of the marvellous that heightened the charm. Compared with the conquests and rewards of the saints the victories and renown of Roland and Amadis waxed dim. Loyola was crippled and could no longer hope to gain distinction at tilt and tournament; but might he not hope to emulate the saints? Might he not plight his fealty to the Queen of Heaven, whose honor he believed had been assailed. "For as the heavens are above the earth would be the service of the knight of the Virgin above the noblest devotions of human chivalry. In her service he would cast his shield over the church which ascribed to her more than celestial dignities; he would bathe in the blood of her enemies the sword once desecrated to the mean ends of worldly ambition."*

* Stephen's "Loyola."

The more Loyola suffered his mind to dwell on this subject the more glorious it appeared. In his delirium he even thought he beheld the being to whom his devotions were addressed—the picture which he had beheld at innumerable shrines had impressed itself upon his imagination. In the first glow of enthusiasm he arose and, like a knight of the Crusades, hung up his weapons at the nearest altar.

Now begins the ascetic period of Loyola's life. As soon as his health was sufficiently restored he betook himself barefooted to a pilgrimage. He waited on the sick in hospitals, dwelt for some time in a cave, where he prepared the first draft of his "*Spiritual Exercises*," and finally went as a pilgrim on foot to the Holy Land, where he conceived a gigantic scheme for the conversion of the Mohammedans, but was turned out of the country by the Christians themselves, for fear that he would embroil them with the Turkish government.*

Loyola seems to have reached the verge of insanity, but he went no further. He never wavered in his consciousness of an exalted mission, but became convinced that extreme penance must necessarily interfere with its accomplishment. Every day he was made to feel the defects of his early training, and at the age of thirty-three he returned to Europe to begin a course of systematic study. For eight years he studied like a schoolboy, spending six of these years at the University of Paris. During all this time he preserved the manner and appearance of an accomplished gentleman; but it was observed that his society had a peculiar fascination for young men. It was reported that a company of students met in his rooms to engage in religious exercises, and Loyola was several times arrested and brought before the Inquisition. It was found that he was a "*Romanist of the Romanists*," and on each occasion of his discharge he solicited and secured a certificate of unimpeachable orthodoxy. This was a shrewd act, for the certificates proved of great service to him in later days.

In the meantime Loyola was quietly extending his influence. It is said that on one occasion he played a game of billiards with

*Dr. Lord's "*Lectures*."

a young nobleman, under the penalty that the loser should serve the winner for six weeks. Loyola won the game, and having locked up his servant compelled him to study the "Spiritual Exercises." At the end of six weeks he had become his enthusiastic disciple. Michelet, who claimed to be a Catholic, described Loyola as "a strange combination of hermit and politician—a Pharisee with the shrewdness of a Macchievelli—a fusion of Spanish asceticism and Italian policy."

On the 15th day of August, 1534, in the morning before day-break, Loyola and six companions ascended the heights of Montmartre, in Paris, and, entering the church on the summit, promised before the altar life-long attachment to each other and unconditional obedience to the pope. This was the beginning of the "Society of Jesus," better known as the Jesuit order. Among these founders, next to Loyola, the most distinguished in later days were Francis Xavier and Diego Laynez.

It is believed that the members of the new society were at first under the impression that their fraternity would develop into a great missionary society, but Loyola's views were evidently much more comprehensive. He afterwards explained to the pope that, while the priests and monks might be regarded as the infantry of the church, he desired the society to be the light cavalry, to hasten to the place where they were most needed at a moment's notice. As some one has expressed it, the Jesuits became "a sword whose hilt was in Rome and whose point was everywhere."

Dr. Lord dates the beginning of the Counter-Reformation from the first vow of the Jesuits at Notre Dame de Montmartre; but this view appears superficial and unsatisfactory. It is only in its militant aspects that this great movement can be held to be so derived. There can, however, be no doubt that soon after this event great changes began to appear in the church of Rome. It was as if a defeated army had at last found a commander to restore its discipline. Every word of Loyola was obeyed by his disciples without hesitation, and it is said that he had to guard his glances for fear that they might be supposed to convey an unspoken command. A single word was enough to separate Francis

Xavier from the company and send him on a missionary journey to India. A recent writer says: "Before the remembrance of Loyola's passionate eloquence, his eyes of fire and his countenance of seraphic piety had passed away from the minds of his own generation, his disciples had planted their missionary stations among the Peruvian mines, in the marts of the African slave-trade, among the islands of the Indian ocean, on the coasts of Hindustan, in the cities of Japan and China, in the recesses of Canadian forests, amid the wilds of the Rocky Mountains." Before the death of Loyola his society numbered more than two thousand members, all educated men, and over one hundred colleges were under its direction. That it had become a mighty power not even its enemies presumed to deny.

It has been asserted that the Jesuits saved the church of Rome, and this may be true, so far as external organization is concerned, but it is also true that they infused into its policy a spirit so malignant, so intractable, as to render the reunion of Christendom a practical impossibility. At the Council of Trent they secured the appointment of three of their number as "the pope's theologians," and Laynez spoke for three days against the adoption of an article which favored the doctrine of justification by faith. It is said that more than one-half of the members of the Council were in favor of granting the cup to the laity, but the Jesuits fought the proposition with all their might, and their enthusiasm carried everything before it.* If the advice of Borromeo had been taken it might have been possible to find a common ground for reunion, but the Jesuits were for war with Protestantism, and in this purpose, at least, the order has never wavered.

Loyola is said to have prayed that his society might never be without enemies, and his petition certainly appears to have been granted. On this subject it is not necessary that Protestants should express a personal opinion; it has been done again and again by professed Catholics in language more decided than Protestant writers would be likely to employ. Hardly had the

* Sir James Stephen, *Edinburgh Review*, 1842.

society been fully organized when Charles Borromeo, who had at first favored it, ordered its members to depart from his diocese. Many of the popes expressed their disapproval of its methods, but with little effect. Paul IV. vainly commanded the society to elect its general for three years and not for life. Nine popes fruitlessly condemned the "Chinese rites" by which the Jesuits had assimilated Christianity to heathenism to gain more converts. Clement XIV. once more attempted to reform the order, but its general met him with the celebrated words: "*Sint ut sunt aut non sint.*" "Let them be as they are or let them not be." In 1773 the pope formally dissolved the society, but the Jesuits waited for better times and in 1805 secured their restoration. Since that time they have not been as numerous as in former times, but they are still a powerful organization and their influence in securing the decrees of the Vatican Council is a matter of common knowledge. "It is clear," says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "that the society has always regarded itself as an independent power, ready, indeed, to coöperate with the papacy as long as their roads and interests are the same and to avail itself to the uttermost of the many pontifical decrees in its favor, but drawing the line far short of practical submission when their interests diverge."

The chief enterprises of the Jesuits have proved gigantic failures. They fomented the wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—the Spanish invasion of England, the war of the League, the struggle in Holland, and the Thirty-Years' War—but in every instance the results were favorable to Protestantism. They established great missions in Japan, in Paraguay, and among the North American Indians, but they have utterly disappeared. "In India," says Michelet with keenest sarcasm, "they did one great thing—they paved the way for the English."

In the Counter-Reformation the Jesuits took the foremost part. Littledale asserts that they were the whole of it, but this statement, as we have seen, is not strictly correct. It was founded on the monastic reformatory movements of the Middle

Ages, and from this fact its reactionary character was mainly derived. In its extreme conservatism it preserved ceremonials and forms of devotion which might well have been discarded, and which have proved a heavy burden to the Church. Its monastic ideals may have fostered private virtues, but they were too narrow to include the highest developments of the life of Christ.

It was to the advantage of the Counter-Reformation that it appeared at a time when the people had grown weary of constant discussion, and were consequently prepared for organized philanthropic efforts. The marvellous success of these efforts deserves recognition and respect, and we do not in the least undervalue the self-sacrifice which it plainly displays. It is not without reason that it has been called the crown and glory of the Counter-Reformation.

As for the matter of organization—in which the fine hand of the Jesuits is most plainly apparent—it has proved both the strength and the weakness of Rome. It has rendered the Church strong as an instrument in the hands of its rulers, but has prevented the free development which is the result of the highest form of life. It is withal responsible for much of the prejudice which continues to separate the churches.

In the present wonderful times the life of Christ demands room for its highest developments. Unless the Counter-Reformation should rise to a higher plane than it now occupies, the future of our country and of the world must remain in Protestant hands. There is, however, a sense in which the Reformation is still in progress, and though for a time denominations may continue to cherish memories of the past, and to do their work in their own peculiar way, the Church will at last reach the period in its development when prejudice and exclusiveness must pass away, and there will be, in the final sense of the prophecy, one fold and one Shepherd.

IV.

SOCIALIST CRITICISM.

BY REV. A. G. GEKELER.

Existing society is made up of two classes, the employing and the employed, the wage-giving and the wage-earning. The word class is sometimes objected to, but economically our society easily falls into these two divisions or classes, and the dividing line is clearly visible in the residence quarters of our towns and in the make-up of our churches.

In the hands of the capitalist class are the means of production; in the hands of the wage class is the ability to labor, physical strength and human skill. The wage worker is strictly dependent upon some capitalist entrepreneur or corporation for the opportunity of earning his subsistence. If religion is the sense of absolute dependence upon God, the religious laborer is sensible of two dependencies, one upon God and one upon the dispenser of employment. Upon the latter the vast majority of laborers are absolutely dependent for the opportunity of living an honest life. Thus the oft-repeated phrase about the identity of interest between labor and capital contains some truth; if capital is in use, labor is employed; if idle, labor also is idle. Thus far the respective interests harmonize; but when it comes to dividing the added value into profits and wages, these interests are as opposed to each other as can be.

And these classes are continually being produced. The system produces capitalist and proletary with the same necessity as the mill turns out flour and bran. The mass of the people is held and fixed in the wage class almost as securely as the slave was held in bondage. Every one feels free, exempt from the coercion of others, but with few exceptions laborers are held by the force of circumstances, by a necessity operating through our system, in the wage-earning class. The epoch of the large con-

cern, the department store and the trust minimizes the chances of rising into the independent employing class and forces many small entrepreneurs back into the working class.

How wage workers are held within their class will appear from a consideration of the iron law of wages, a phrase of Lasalle's and a notion effectively used by Socialists. When we speak of economic laws we must remember that they are really economic tendencies; they do not execute themselves with like unfailing certainty and force as the law of gravity. The iron law of wages is the tendency of wages to seek that point where they just suffice for bare subsistence of the laborer and the rearing of the average workman's family. It is claimed that wages tend to vibrate about that point, sometimes rising a little above, sometimes falling a little below. Bare subsistence must further be qualified, as the lowest degree of comfort, on which men will consent to work and marry. It is the lowest standard of living that men will submit to and on which they will found families. If American working people would submit to the Chinese or East Indian standard of living, there would, of course, be large room for wages to fall and the law would be discredited, or if men would cheerfully imitate the New England publicist who for a few days experimented upon himself in order to learn how cheaply he could live on corn meal, no doubt our wageworkers could save money even in our present hard times. But Americans are not yet willing to live like that and to furnish an army of workers for the next generation on such a standard. And they ought not to do so. The object of civilized society is not the filling of the earth with human beings, not mere life, but civilized human life, under humane conditions and with the largest possible measure of comfort and culture.

The iron law of wages, then, is the tendency of wages to settle about the level of the lowest standard of living, to which the working classes of a country are accustomed, or with which they will put up. And we submit that there is such a tendency. There are but two ways in which it can be resisted. One is by the refusal to marry and found families. That is self-evident.

An income that will not suffice for the support of a family will probably be ample for an individual. But this is a way of overcoming the alleged law by not submitting to the conditions under which the law operates, and the cunning of nature provides that few choose that way. The other is by combination. No one can doubt that the union has kept the rate of wages higher than if there had been no combination. In Indianapolis the stonemasons and bricklayers have succeeded in securing the union rates of wages during all the four years of the panic; the house-carpenters' union, however, representing a far greater number of mechanics, has gone to pieces, and the wage rate has been about halved. In prosperity the union usually secures living wages, but in long continued depressions the force of circumstances proves stronger than the union. And, if in such times the unionist secures his wage rate, no device known will secure him work, so that the unionized workman is thrust into a lower scale of living, and his opportunities are destroyed as well as in the case of no combination. But large numbers of wageworkers cannot be organized, and the union succeeds by limiting the supply of workers in a trade and thus destroying competition for work. All unions of skilled artisans limit the number of apprentices, and thus many are denied the privilege of learning trades and are thrown into the army of common laborers and the casually employed. This is one serious objection to the labor union; another is, that by as much as unionists secure better pay, the condition of unorganized labor is made worse, since the mass of consumers must make the higher wages of the union men good through higher rents and prices. The union is thus available for but a portion of the laboring class, and a movement that does not contemplate the good of all cannot afford the desired remedy nor lead us out of the wilderness.

In the investigation of this alleged iron law it is necessary to consider more fully the conditions of production now obtaining. If the daily wage is multiplied by 300 the approximate number of working days in the year, we will have a sum larger than is compatible with our law. But if we make the proper deduction

on account of involuntary idleness the law will agree with experience. Carroll Wright estimates the number of workers idle in normal times at 5 per cent. ; but what the number has been the past four years no one has the necessary data to base an estimate on. It certainly has been very large. How many concerns have been closed entirely for long periods, or have been running with a diminished force ? And where employment has been continuous how many cases of reduced wages are found. During Harrison's administration, that golden age of high tariff, the coal miners of western Maryland lacked employment fully one-fourth of the time ; on an average men were able and ready to earn 25 per cent. more than the state of the market permitted.

Now, the more exactly the iron law of wages is realized in fact, the clearer it becomes that the mass of laborers form a class from which individuals can rise only by rare fortune or rare gifts ; a class harassed and disquieted by the fact that while the expenses of living are continuous the opportunity to dispose of their labor is quite uncertain.

And the corollary to this iron law is that the capitalist class absorbs the wealth destined for increased production. That the rich grow richer when the mass of the people is limited to a subsistence is mathematically certain, provided there is increase in wealth at all. Thus, too, the poverty of the masses, no less than the riches of the few, is the natural and necessary result of our system. We are moving toward the condition that a few millionaires and millions of poor people make up the nation.

And here we may further touch upon the sorest spot of present conditions. It is neither in the power of employer nor employe to avoid these breaks in employment. While we feel that something is wrong we can blame no one. Employer and employe are both under a power outside themselves against which they are helpless. That power is the effective demand of the markets. The ability to produce commodities is constant, expansive, practically unlimited ; the opportunities to exchange them are irregular, limited. The ability to produce is much in excess, we cannot say of the desires of consumers, but of what can be sold. Production is

always able and ready to outrun actual consumption, but must always take a rest until consumption catches up. The trust alone is in the position to calculate consumption and then to determine the output; the trust alone can guarantee constant employment to a limited number of men. All other concerns are subject to great fluctuations in the markets; when demand makes itself felt, concerns that have suffered from slack markets rush into activity and soon the output necessitates renewed restriction of production. Twice within half a year have the New England factories of textiles shut down in order to lessen the glut of the market. The course of industry therefore is not a level, but a seesaw between active demand and no demand; this means for the entrepreneur distracting care, and introduces something akin to gambling: the necessity of making ventures without the ability to make up a clear judgment. And for the wageworker it means a state of uncertainty as to obtaining the means of life that is harassing to an extreme degree.

There is a great difference also in their effect upon character between an occasional holiday and frequent periods of enforced idleness. A holiday is of a joyous nature, a day of relaxation and visiting, from which men return to their daily tasks with renewed energy and vigor. But the period of enforced idleness is dreary and dull, a time of care, often distress and discouragement. The rainy day fund is encroached upon, the effort to save is thwarted, thrift and enterprise are apt to be checked by the thought that it is all of no avail. There can be no doubt that irregular employment tends to weaken and imperil the character of those affected and their dependent families, and in judging the working classes this most important enviroing feature ought not be lost sight of. If there is often mischief for idle hands to do, there is worse mischief for enforced idleness; it favors the increase of poverty, intemperance and domestic discord. A life from which hope is largely excluded, a career that engages few high sentiments and aspirations, and is handicapped by sordid care and often embittered by a vague sense of injustice—must this not profoundly affect character? Will it raise a man to his best or tend to sink him to his worst?

It is an evil moreover, which cannot, it seems, be remedied in such a way that freedom of industry, contract and competition can be left intact; an evil, evidently, for the remedying of which there is no proposal before society but that of socialism in some form.

Karl Marx points out these periods of boom and ruin in the English cotton trade. After reviewing the course of the trade from 1770 to 1863 he sums up as follows: *Capital*, vol. ii, p. 461, "We find thus in the first 45 years of the English cotton trade, from 1770-1815, only 5 years of crisis and stagnation; but this was the period of monopoly. The second period, from 1815 to 1863 counts, during its 48 years, only 20 years of revival and prosperity against 28 of depression and stagnation. Between 1815 and 1830 the competition with the continent of Europe and with the United States sets in. After 1833 the extension of the Asiatic markets is enforced by "destruction of the human race" (the wholesale extinction of the Indian handloom weavers). After the repeal of the corn laws, from 1846 to 1863 there are 8 years of moderate activity and prosperity against 9 years of depression and stagnation." The Civil War caused the cotton famine and sore distress among the operatives. "From the indications as to the condition of the markets of the world in 1860 and 1861, we see that the cotton famine came in the nick of time for the manufacturers and was to some extent advantageous to them, a fact that was acknowledged in the reports of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, proclaimed in Parliament by Palmerston and Derby and confirmed by events." The fact was that the markets were so glutted with goods that even in 1863 they had not absorbed the whole lot and a crisis was inevitable even without the famine.

It seems certain that this unsteadiness in industry increases and becomes more acute from one critical period to another and that we must prepare ourselves to live under a permanent crisis. Depression and stagnation are becoming chronic and normal. The shortening of the labor day would afford some temporary relief by lessening the number of idle men and increasing con-

sumption; but as the fertility of labor increases by reason of more efficient machinery and cheaper transportation, society would after a while again be in the same straits. The past four years cover perhaps the longest crisis period in our history, a period not yet ended and threatening to continue still for considerable time. We do well to remember with grateful hearts that they have been years of unusually abundant harvests and low prices for provisions. Who does not tremble to think what might have happened if the harvests had been bad and scarcity prices had prevailed? But what we have now escaped through a beneficent Providence is not this certain sometime to befall us?

When Proudhon defines property as theft the majority of men look upon the declaration as violent and highly exaggerative, for although every one has knowledge of individuals who wrongfully possess property, the majority of property owners are known to have made their acquisitions by honest toil or in legitimate business. When Socialists make such declarations we must understand their premises. And we must remember that men like Marx expressly disavow the intention of stigmatizing capitalists as thieves and robbers, although Marx would probably subscribe the definition of Proudhon. How, then, does capital grow? It can grow only when its roots are in the labor process, in production. The growth of capital rests upon the fact that labor commonly produces a value in excess of its cost, a surplus value. In the process of production a laborer produces a value equal to the value of the wages he receives; he produces the equivalent of his wages day by day, but in a profitable business he produces a value greater than his wages, a surplus value. If all outlays in production, such as wages, salaries, insurance, taxes, wear and tear, cost of raw materials, are added together, the resulting product is found to be of greater market value than was laid out in production. And if we seek for the source of this additional value we can find it only in the fact that the wageworker received—not less than his labor was worth—but less than his labor produced. The laborer has received what his labor is worth; for labor has a value whose magnitude may be estimated in the same manner

as the value of any commodity. A thing is worth what it customarily costs to produce it. And so the value of labor, or wages, depends upon the cost of rearing the workman up to his entrance upon the labor market plus his daily subsistence. If x represents the cost of rearing a laborer to maturity, y the average daily living expense and z the number of days available in the life of the average workingman, then the formula $\frac{x}{z} + y$ represents the cost or

value of an average day's work. This method of getting at the cost of labor, the natural wage, is borne out by the rates of wages paid in countries having a low standard of living, *e. g.*, India, China, the South. But the labor performed in a day imparts to the raw material a value greater than this cost of labor, a certain quantity of surplus value, and from this surplus value capital draws its nourishment in the form of interest, profits, dividends and rent. Here nothing is to be seen of the boasted identity of interest between labor and capital. The whole quarrel is about the disposition of the surplus value. The capitalist class now appropriates it; the Socialist claims that the laborer is entitled to it. By transferring this surplus value from the pockets of capitalists to the commonwealth the production of the classes will cease; then will there be neither proletary nor capitalist, but laborers of brain and brawn receiving, as nearly as possible in this world, what they create.

Socialists, it will be perceived, set down nothing to the credit of machinery in this surplus-value, arguing that only the actual wear and tear on the plant, cost of superintendence, insurance, taxes and raw materials enter into the actual cost of commodities. No place is left for interest on capital as *none is left for interest on the cost of the laborer.*

It is true that the machine is the greatest multiplying factor by far in the production of wealth, of use values; machinery is manifoldly more efficient than the operative's labor. But in estimating the magnitude of exchange or market value the cost of labor represented in the commodity and not the degree of utility is regulative. It is exchange values, not use values, that feed capi-

tal. Values that cannot be expressed by and turned into the money forms are of no avail to the increase of capital, and it is in proportion as values are the depositories of labor that they admit of this change.

And so it is found to be in fact. If the value added to the raw material in the process of production is divided into two parts, one representing the value added by labor, the other the value added by the efficiency of machinery, it will be found that the latter value cannot be realized. Forty years ago all shoes were made by hand and the cost of labor entering into a pair of shoes may be put down as \$2. To-day, by the use of machinery, perhaps twenty pairs of shoes of like quality are turned out by the same labor and in like time. Nineteen pairs of shoes thus represent the efficiency of the machine. But no manufacturer dreams of selling the twenty pairs of shoes for the cost of raw material, plus wear and tear, plus \$38, which sum represents the saving in cost by machine production. A profit of \$38 per day per workmen is indeed beyond the dreams of capital; nor will the operative now earn \$40 per day; he may be thankful indeed if he receives the \$2 which his father earned. Now the twenty pairs of shoes, as use values are worth twenty times as much as one pair. They represent twenty times the wealth, twenty times the utility and comfort, but they do not bear twenty times the exchange or market value. As soon as the manufacture of shoes by machinery is well established, the market value of shoes will fall by as much as they contain less labor minus the wear and tear on the plant, and, at present, minus the profit that can be extracted from the transaction. When commodities are exchanged labor is balanced against labor, the surplus value having first been abstracted. Use-values are subject to few changes but those of decay; exchange-values are affected by their freight of labor, by inventions, monopolies, fashions.

Labor is thus indeed the factor which produces market or exchange value. Out of the profit on labor, out of surplus-labor creating surplus-value capital is composed, and the capitalist classes are fed.

The increased productivity or fertility of labor, by reason of improved machinery *gradually* becomes a common benefit. Under free competition—a thing becoming rarer from year to year—consumers eventually reap the entire benefit arising from the use of machinery; this is a good which, under the conditions named, cannot be monopolized. But we say *gradually* and *eventually*, for until a process or machine becomes the common property of all competitors, many individual capitalists will have greatly increased their capitals.

And it is only by participating *quâ* consumers in the cheapening of commodities that the common people are benefited by the material progress of society, a gain to which must be noted the serious offset, that the machine makes the laborer superfluous. When this cheapening of commodities is adduced, as proof that the poor are better off than formerly, inasmuch as a greater number of desirable things are within their reach, it ought not be forgotten that the laborer still fails to receive what he produces, is often necessarily idle, and that the standard of living is altered by this very cheapening. Besides it does not alter the comparative positions of the classes, as the lower prices redound to the advantage of both.

While the competitive system is supposed to provide the maximum efficiency in production and a maximum product, a little reflection shows the falsity of this view. The individual plant, indeed, is interested in applying the greatest economy, and a failure to do so is soon brought to light by a reduction of profit and output. But in spite of the rigid economies practiced in the individual concern, the system involves and supports an enormous wastefulness. And it does this through an injudicious multiplication of the means of production, with the result that these means of production cannot be fully used. But just so far as the means of production cannot be exploited to their full capacity, they represent waste. An ideal system of industry would keep its productive appliances in full use and activity; it would not lock up and bury labor and capital in unneeded establishments. A case in point is the paralleling of railroads. There can be no doubt that

the plant of the N. Y. C. R. R. is sufficient to carry its own freight, besides what its former rival, the West Shore, carries. The sum represented by the latter road thus represents almost entirely so much waste. And the final result of such parallels is to keep rates high, a result which, of course, is possible only because railroads are natural monopolies. For now the N. Y. C. is obliged to make dividends and interest on its own plant and also on the capital invested in the leased West Shore. And this waste of capital and labor extends through all industry, not excepting our churches and institutions of learning. The capital and labor of our country are able to turn out an output much greater than they do.

The department store is the one concern now rapidly coming to the front, which eliminates this waste; its capital rapidly changes the money form to the commodity form, and *vice versa*, and its staff of employees is in constant activity. The trust fails to accomplish as much, because a large amount of its capital, locked up in closed plants, is idle and, notwithstanding the spreading opposition to these forms of industrial organizations, they are likely to be permanent. But, like improvements in machinery, they made the laborer superfluous.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." The certain and natural effects of our system of private property, and competition on upper and lower classes are not of a character to recommend the system. The struggle for existence, which goes on untempered in the plant and brute creation, serves its purpose in those spheres most excellently; no higher ends exist for them than the production of individuals fit to live and preserve their kind. But among men something more than strong bodies and fierce wills are desired. Men everywhere are aware of a moral ideal, of the obligatoriness and sacredness of truth and right and love. Fidelity to the moral ideal is universally felt to be the duty and glory of man, and history teaches unceasingly that moral forces constitute the power and stability of nations.

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay."

And how does this moral ideal fare under the strain of universal competition? Better than might be expected, indeed, for Heaven takes an interest in it and Providence keeps it under its own patronage. It lives in spite of our social system and not because of it. The effect of competition, calling into activity the selfishness and lower tendencies of our natures, is altogether against the ascendancy of right and truth and love. Our system mightily fosters a selfish and materialistic spirit in society, for it gives men social importance not in proportion to their virtues, their wisdom and skill, but in proportion to their worldly means. Man is not the measure of all things, but money. Success is our idol. In order to succeed, every consideration is pushed aside, and success attained, all stains are covered with the mantle of forgetfulness. Even honesty is recommended on the ground that it is the best policy. Bismarck long ago said, "The lie is a world power of the first magnitude," and even that blunt man of blood and iron made use of this power in his diplomacy.

In the sphere of legislation the principle of our society becomes the source of corruption and class legislation. Many things are attempted and many accomplished that point to bribery and corruption, as the only reasonable explanation. Elections are evidently very expensive, and it is not denied from what sources the contributions come, nor is it a secret what equivalents are expected and obtained. It is well known, for example, that in Germany the tariff on provisions is laid in order to hold the vote of the nobility and landed gentry on the side of the government. Bread is made dear for the many poor and hungry in order that the great landholders may be conciliated. Can there be a ranker injustice? And yet we do similar things in this land of democracy. In tariff legislation it is not the comfort and happiness of men and women and children that it sought, but the enhancement of property and capital. In short, our system rests upon an injustice, namely, the appropriation by capital of the surplus-value, that life-blood of economic prosperity and growth; it is wasteful beyond calculation, it multiplies temptations, it encroaches upon the rights, destroys the hopes and embitters the lives of the mass of the people.

V.

THE PERSONAL ELEMENT IN PREACHING.

BY REV. GEO. W. RICHARDS.

The test of centuries has proven the foolishness of preaching to be the wisdom of God. The prophet of the Hebrews, the philosopher of the heathen, and the preacher of the Christian Church have been the molding force of the thought, emotion, and action of the world's life. The rapid spread of the gospel of Jesus Christ and its world-wide conquest, against apparently insuperable difficulties, show the power of truth proclaimed by man to his fellow. The decay of religion, morality, and civilization, whenever and wherever the pulpit is superseded by the altar, the preacher by the priest, is a negative evidence of the positive influence of preaching. In the tracks of the gospel, civilization with its attendants, education and commerce, are sure to follow. The living voice of the preacher has awakened nations, dead in idolatry and superstition, and they arose in newness of life.

Preaching will remain the great power for the maintenance and completion of the kingdom of truth to the end of time. Inventions cannot take the place of the *viva voce* gospel. The printing press, the telephone, and the phonograph can only be handmaids of the pulpit. They can never fill it. Only when the preacher becomes a machine, instead of a living personal force, is he in danger of the competition of these mechanisms of his age. "The word of God, the testimony of Jesus, the gospel of our Salvation preached in tongues of men of every race is to be the form of power by which the Kingdom of God in our dispensation is to spread abroad and prevail."

There have been prophets, accordingly, since the world began. These have interpreted God to their generation. Their message came fresh from the heart over the lips. They wrote after they spoke. Moses objected his slowness of speech to God's call.

Isaiah's mouth was touched by a live coal from the altar. His lips were purged for his message. The symbol of the Spirit's coming was cloven tongues like as of fire. The two greatest teachers of the ancient world entrusted their wisdom to oral speech. Neither Christ nor Socrates wrote a book. The latter, being asked why he did not write his instructions, replied: "I would rather write upon the hearts of living men than upon the skins of dead sheep." They had the same confidence in the word of truth which the sower has in his seed. Cast it into the soil and it will take care of itself. "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth, it shall not return unto me void." Isai. 55: 11.

A large part of Christ's ministerial activity was devoted to the training of preachers. No act had more significance for the future of his kingdom than the choice of apostles. He continued all night in prayer. He felt how much depended upon the little band who were to be his mouthpiece after the ascension. He laid the matter before his Heavenly Father, and when it was day he called unto him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named Apostles. He took them under his special supervision. To them he revealed the mysteries of the kingdom. He sent them out on preaching tours and taught them by precept and example for the work which they were about to begin. In his final commission he commanded them to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.

This last injunction gives us the elements of preaching. It is the deliverance of a message from Jesus Christ to men, by men sent forth from Christ. The preacher, therefore, is a messenger of Jesus. Malachi called the priest, "the messenger of the Lord of Hosts." John was a man sent from God. Jesus was sent by the Father. Hence he could say; "As the Father hath sent me even so send I you." (John 20-21.) The preacher is a messenger like the prophet, the Christ, and the apostle. In this respect he differs from the philosopher and the scientist. In a broad sense they, too, are messengers of the truth, yet they do not have the specific commission of the apostle. The messenger of the Glori-

fied Christ is clothed with authority, and endowed with power, more than he would be as a mere individual. The same man coming as a citizen to the Court of St. James could not command the attention and audience which he would have as an ambassador of the United States. He then represents seventy million people. By them he is supported and protected from insult and harm. The preacher is the ambassador of Him unto whom all power in heaven and earth is given. That power co-operates with him and is active in his behalf. Great is the significance of the last words spoken to the seventy, both for themselves and their audience. "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me, and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me." The rejection of the divine messengers was the doom of Jerusalem and will always bring the wrath of God upon every city that "killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto her." (Luke x, 16.)

As a messenger he is the bearer of a message. It is an *εὐαγγέλιον*, a good message, from God to the world. The message must authenticate the messenger. He, in his own mind, may be convinced of his mission but not so the people. His ordination, his installation, or his priestly robe do not in themselves approve him. He must speak with authority and not as the scribes. His opinions and speculations are of no more value than those of the audience, driven by the wind and tossed. He cannot originate his message, but must receive it. "The Lord God hath spoken who can but prophesy." (Amos 3,-8.) "Thus saith the Lord," breathes through his speech. He need not say so; the people feel it. Such positive doctrine has been the strength of the ruling minds of nations, whether in the propagation of truth or error. Preaching of that kind will never lack an audience. The publicans and sinners flocked to hear Jesus. Crowds of all classes trembled before John the Baptist. He was a voice, not an echo. Woe to the Church when her preachers cease to be a voice, and become a mere echo.

This definition of preaching is one-sided and defective. The messenger and the message may be independent of each other.

The wire is not conscious of the tidings it transmits. The King's messenger often bears sealed messages, with which he is not personally concerned. Certain prophets received revelations external to them and they declared them as external things. They were mere tools in the Spirit's hands. The hand of the Lord so came upon Gideon and Samson. The child Samuel heard his voice. The serpent in Eden and the ass of Balaam are extreme instances of such communications. The preacher may sink to the level of that rude form of prophecy and still be a messenger with a message. (Brigg's *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 12.)

This defect is overcome when we consider the other term applied by Christ to the Apostles. "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 1-8.) The messenger must be a witness also, and the message a personal testimony. Then he will speak of that which he has heard, that which he has seen with his eyes, that which his hands handled concerning the Word of Life. (I. John 1-1.) The message percolates through his personality and becomes an experience of his life. In his epistles John does not narrate the historical facts and incidents of the earthly life of Jesus as any contemporary might have seen them. But in His Gospel and Epistles He interpreted the significance of those facts both for himself and the people whom he addressed. He bore testimony under the direction of the Spirit of Truth. For only after the Comforter had come could they be witnesses of Jesus. (John 15 ; 26, 27.) A cold, indifferent, and unapplied recital of the birth, death and resurrection, is not preaching Christ. It is not a personal testimony to the power and significance of those events upon the spiritual welfare of men. Those facts spiritually discerned and felt in their relation to personal salvation will make the preacher a lawful and true witness of Jesus Christ. He must not originate his testimony. He cannot testify beyond his vital experience. In the former case he is untrustworthy, in the latter he is uncertain. This phase of preaching reveals the importance of the personal element which enters into it. Great responsibility rests upon it.

Truth and personality are closely related. Without a person truth would be like a cannon ball without a cannon. A person becomes both powder and cannon by which the truth is projected. Truth, like oxygen, pervades the atmosphere, but the oxygen only becomes visible in the burning candle. The candle is the exponent of the oxygen. "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord." (Prov. 20-27.) Truth surrounds the brute, but the brute can neither see nor expound it. The person of man alone is the center, in which and through which truth is revealed. But like as the carbon is concealed by the flash of the electric rays, the preacher's personality should be irradiated by the celestial light which he emits. Not like as water is led through pipes from the reservoir into the homes of a city, does the Gospel flow through the mouth of the preacher into the ears of his people. Rather like as the tree drinks in the sunshine and dew, draws nutriment from its soil, and absorbs them until they are transformed into luscious fruit, does the preacher assimilate truth which becomes the precious food of his audience. He is a tree of life whose leaves are for the healing of the nation.

When we speak of the personal element in preaching we do not refer to the eccentricities or individuality of the preacher. It includes these but is more than these. They are transient and accidental. The personal is permanent and essential. God could only reveal Himself to a person. God in the universe without a person was like Adam in Eden when he had no helpmeet, or more literally, no one "answering to him." In this vast system of suns and planets, "this interminable wilderness of worlds," there was no one answering to God. He could not impart himself in love to rocks and trees. They could not be His companions. In man, however, He found a creature, in His own image, after His own likeness. He drew nigh in love, man could respond. He revealed His wisdom and man could read His thoughts.

As the person of man became the intelligent recipient of divine revelation, he also became its medium of expression. The sea could not reveal God. The poet speaks figuratively when he calls the ocean, the

"Glorious mirror, where the Almighty form
Glasses itself in tempests,
The image of Eternity, the throne
Of the Invisible."

The heavens but partly declare the glory of God. Through these avenues of nature we may approach the realm invisible and the power eternal. *Yet a person only can reveal a person.* Man, therefore, is the only efficient medium of divine revelation. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." (Mat. 11-27.) The perfect revelation could come only through the perfect man. This element in man through which God has revealed Himself in patriarchs, and prophets, apostles, and saints is the medium through which the gospel of His Son must forever pass, be vitalized, and interpreted to the generations which come and go. The Holy Spirit works through human personality. The truths of Jesus must continually incarnate themselves in the men of the age before they can mold the age. Through them must play freely the messages of God. The Personal Element in the preaching of the truth accordingly serves a wise practical purpose in the plan of salvation.

I. First of all, *it is the Bond of Union between the old Gospel and the new Age.* The personality of the preacher is new. It is about the only new thing under the sun. The gospel is old. The old gospel should be renewed by the new person. Paul would not send the epistle to the Romans to Boston. He sent quite another letter to Ephesus. The Boston preacher, however, must apply the eternal truths of Romans to the necessities of Bostonian life. The Bible contains a body of truth which we accept as the revelation of God. It is a revelation to the Jewish nation, however, before it is a message to the American people. It was once the living experience of individuals and of a nation. Their relations toward God, man and the devil are recorded in the various forms of literature. Yet the Bible of the Hebrews, like the nation of which it speaks, is in one sense a dead book. It treats of ages past and nations gone. But the same Bible, apprehended, assimilated and reproduced in the form

and fashion of the nineteenth century by a living person, becomes the power and wisdom of God. That is the function of the preacher.

He is a representative of the needs, the inquiries and tendencies of his time. To him, personally and first, comes the message of old. In it he must find an answer to his own questions, peace for his own soul, comfort for his own troubles. He must have an ear to hear what "*the Spirit saith,*" *not hath said*, to the churches. The dead material of the past is taken up by the roots and rootlets of his personality and changed into the form of his own life. Only as he is himself apprehended by the truth can he interpret it in a living way to others. He needs, therefore, to live in close touch with his surroundings. The welfare of his community is of vital interest to him. With the tender care of a Shepherd he will watch over his flock. He has no right to live behind his age. He is rather unfortunate if he is born ahead of his time. The great preachers of the ages have allowed the past to bury its dead, and the future to solve its problems. The present was their divinely allotted sphere.

Such a sympathetic union with one's environment is the result of the activity of the whole nature of man. The scholar in his study may master the dominant scientific and theologic principles. It is well that he should. Yet he may remain cold and be unable to reach men in the shop, the counting room and on the market. These are the living epistles upon which are recorded the feelings and thoughts and motives of the hour. Only by the closest observation of man and all the passing affairs of the Home, School, Church and the State can he feel the pulse throbs of the spirit of life around him. Opened manward, the soul should be thrown wide open Godward. God is the unchangeable in the midst of the uncertain movements of the tides of life's sea. Christ speaks the word, and the storm-driven waves obey and are still. In these troublous times that calm and peace, which the world cannot give, can be obtained only by the perception of the eternal glimmering through the temporal into the inner consciousness of men. The Bible and the age are thus wedded by a

living personality. The old message comes through a new person. Then the Bible and the preacher fulfil their mission.

II. *The Personal Element is a Means for the proper distribution of the Gospel.* The same gospel has to be adapted to different people. Paul was free from all men, yet he made himself the servant unto all. "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak. I am made all things to all men that I might by all means save some." (I. Cor. ix. 20-39.) The apostle to the gentiles had wonderful versatility. This was due to his previous training and his varied experience. He could enter the synagogue, and like a learned rabbi expound the Law and the Prophets. Before the philosophers of Athens he felt at home, and boldly presented his cause. In the palaces of Kings he spoke with becoming grace and dignity. Few men, however, have the genius of Paul. Different men, accordingly, have diversities of gifts but the same spirit. In the choice of the twelve, Jesus was undoubtedly guided by their personalities. He sought such a diversity of temperament and training as would fit them to preach to all the classes of Israel.

Corresponding to this variety of personality in preachers, there is a difference in the people. There are national, social, intellectual, and moral distinctions. These are the results of ages of development and growth. However much we may insist upon the equality of all men before God, we cannot destroy the lines of division, inherent in the world's life. They will be made to minister, in the divine plan, towards the complete development of man in history. It becomes, therefore, necessary that the gospel be adapted to these divisions. Canon Liddon could command the breathless attention of his vast audience in St. Paul's. He might have failed in the Metropolitan Tabernacle. Spurgeon, great as he was, would hardly have satisfied the audience which sat spell-bound under Liddon's voice. The evangelist in the New York slums, is reaching a class which Philips Brooks could

not have touched. Mission boards have learnt by experience that a native Japanese ministry is far more effective than the most cultured European or American missionary. Matthew became an open door for Christ into the center of the community of publicans and sinners. He chose some fishermen. But he did not send a Galilean fisherman to Athens, the paradise of philosophers, or to Rome to preach to those of Cæsar's palace. He found his servant at the feet of Gamaliel. In our times these diversities of human conditions have not been lessened. Our hope of bringing the gospel of Jesus to all nations, classes, and individuals, is based upon the various personalities of the men who are prepared from their mother's womb for their life's mission.

Yet this truth is frequently overlooked. The great diversity of operations in the Church surpasses the comprehension and liberality of the average Christian. One is too shallow, the other too fanciful, the third too profound. The customs and habits of the ecclesiastical life of the fathers must not be broken. The form of address, the substance of the discourse, are measured by a Procrustean standard and thereby approved or condemned. It is a criminal attempt to repress personality and rob the individual of those characteristics which were designed to make him an original messenger of God. Styles of sermons, modes of thought, are as manifold as preachers. The white sunlight does not display its wealth of color and beauty before it passes through the scientist's prism. Who would dream of the rainbow in the sunray? The unsearchable riches of Christ Jesus, the Light of the World, can only be appreciated after passing through the countless personalities by which the truth is revealed in living form and adapted to the comprehension of all men.

III. *The Personal Element gives Originality and Freshness to the old message.* The preacher may well despair of presenting new truth. The gospel has been preached for so many centuries, by most scholarly and devout men, that originality in the sense of newness is practically impossible. That, however, is not the meaning of originality. The same truth may be as original with me as with Homer. Two things are original and new, the per-

sonality and the age. These two are the preacher's hope against vain repetitions, vague platitudes, and the ghastly dead line. The words of Jesus passing through a unique person will partake of his impress. Every preacher who allows the truth to sink into him and be assimilated and absorbed must become original. There will be the freshness of the morning dew and the brightness of the rising sun in his discourse. He is preaching Christ as Christ apprehended him. The same text, accordingly, yields many sermons to different individuals. No two preachers can preach the same sermons if they are true to themselves. The young man, who exhausted the Gospels and epistles the first year of his ministry, lacked the personal enlargement which a single year's preaching will necessarily produce. In giving forth truth, the seed of a new harvest is sown. As the years advance and the intellect, will, and affections unfold, the truth must take possession of the expanding mind and captivate the heart. When that is the case the dead line comes only with the death line. The congregation will not weary of their preacher because of his age. Neither will they long after young blood for their pulpit. There are preachers with gray hair in Reformed pulpits who preach with the power and vivacity of youth. Every year seems to increase their strength; while the outward man perisheth, the inner man is renewed day by day. Others, however, have reached the dead line on this side of the forties, possibly because they never held on to the life line.

At this point we cannot help quoting at some length the words of Philips Brooks. "If a preacher is not a man of his age, in sympathy with its spirit, his preaching fails. He wonders that the truth has grown so powerless. But it is not the truth that has failed. It is the other element, the person. That is the reason why sometimes the old preacher finds his well-known power gone and complains that while he is still in his vigor people are looking to younger men for the work which they once delighted to demand of him. There are noble examples on the other side; old men with a personality as vitally sympathetic with the changing age as the truth which they preach is true to the word

of God. They have a power which no young man can begin to wield and the world owns it willingly. People would rather see old men than young men in their pulpits, if only the old men bring them both elements of preaching, a faith that is eternally true and a person that is in quick and ready sympathy with their present life. If they can have but one they are apt to choose the latter, but what they really want is both and the noblest ministries in the church are those of old men who have kept the freshness of youth." He strikes at the root of the present day demand for young preachers and the premature decay of the old ones. When there is a personal appropriation of the infinite treasures of truth and a sympathetic contact with the people, the preacher will flourish like the palm tree. He shall bring forth fruit in old age. He shall be fat and flourishing.

The Personal Element is not fixed, so as to prevent culture and development. It is true, all men are not born equal. Blood will tell. The training of preachers begins a hundred years before they are born. The blood of centuries flows in their veins. We speak about the humble origin of Jesus, yet humanly speaking he had the best Jewish blood, a scion of David's house. No one, however, is responsible for the fortunes and misfortunes of birth and ancestry. But he is responsible for the best use of those talents which he has received. As a moral and intellectual being, man can fully apprehend and show forth God through the faculties which make him akin to Deity. These faculties are subject to law, and obedience to that law is the condition of growth. In preaching, perhaps, more than in any other form of activity, all the powers of man are called into action. He, then, who has made the most of his physical, intellectual and moral qualities, will be the best instrument of the Holy Spirit, and the most efficient medium of divine truth.

There are two typical classes in the ministry of the Church. The one reminds you of the vineyard in a very fruitful hill. The Lord made a trench about it and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with choicest vine. And he looked that it should bring forth *grapes* and it brought forth *wild grapes*. They pass

through the institutions of the Church. They are accepted as the pastors of congregations. They are under the care of Providence. Yet they become lean of soul. Their personality withers. Their mind shrinks. Their heart becomes hard and cold. It is a case of intellectual and spiritual starvation. When they should bring forth grapes, they bring forth wild grapes.

The other is like the fruit-laden tree under the shadow of whose branches children love to play, and the weary are refreshed. He has a rich personality. Out of the environment of his half a century he has drawn from God, nature and man, nutritious food for body, mind and heart. By instinct, he has rejected the vicious, low and immoral. He has opened his leaves and spread his branches, to bathe in the sunlight of heaven, and drink the crystal drops of the cloud. He speaks the same old truths, but they are electrified and radiant with his irresistible life. It is not his giant intellect, nor his eloquent tongue, nor even his practical tact, but the calm, majestic, silent influence of his personality, aglow with God, which is a perpetual benediction to his church, his community and his home.

VI.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. A BIBLICO- THEOLOGICAL STUDY.

BY THE EDITOR.

Paul was the greatest of all the Apostles; and the Epistle to the Romans is the greatest of all his literary productions. In this Epistle, written to a church which was destined to exercise an immeasurable influence upon the fortunes of Christendom, he comes nearest to giving a systematic representation of the Christian faith as it had taken shape in his own mind. Hence to understand this Epistle is to understand Paul's conception of Christianity. It is, however, one of the strange phenomena of history that the church to which this Epistle was first addressed, has never understood it. The Roman Church, with its legalistic doctrine of salvation by works, is more in accord with Paul's Judaizing opponents than with the mind of Paul himself. This is a fact which was recognized by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. But the Reformers were themselves too much under the influence of Augustinian and Medieval ideas to be able to do full justice to Paul's teaching; and it is only in the biblical theology of more recent times that the spell of dogmatic traditionalism has been broken, and the Apostle's great thoughts have come to be apprehended, not in the light of the bishop of Hippo, but in the light which belongs to themselves. It is the design of this paper, and of others that may follow, to endeavor, in this light, to understand the teaching of the Epistle to the Romans in regard to some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

The leading principles of this epistle are anthropological and soteriological ideas. St. Paul, in all his writings, shows more predilection for the doctrines of redemption and justification than

for the more speculative doctrine of Christ's person, and treats the former much more fully than the latter. This turn of his thought was doubtless due, in part, to his personal religious experience, and, in part also to the attitude of the Jewish opponents of Christianity. Paul was one who had sought righteousness through the works of the law, but failed to find what he sought. He was a scrupulous observer of that law of which his race was so enormously proud. He observed its feasts and fasts. He offered the sacrifices which it prescribed. He repeated the regulation prayers with painful precision. He washed often. He was careful of his meat and drink, so as to swallow no unholy thing. In a word, he lived strictly according to the law, in this respect exceeding most of his equals among his countrymen. (Gal. i. 14.) But, like Luther at Erfurth, engaged in similar practices, he failed to derive any satisfaction from all this legal devotion. His soul could not be quieted by any such performances. He was taught that God is a jealous God, who will by no means justify the ungodly. Every act of transgression and every motion of involuntary sin must be strictly expiated before it can be forgiven. But Paul performed his expiatory rites to no purpose. After every act of expiation his conscience cried out for new acts of the same kind. He had never done enough. The law was always accusing him, and he could never satisfy its demands. (Cf. Heb. ix. 9.) It was in this way that he proved what a psalmist had already experienced; that by the works of the law no flesh can be justified in God's sight. (Rom. iii. 20.) But what he could not obtain by the many works of the law, that he obtained by one act of faith in Jesus Christ. That righteousness before God, that sense of peace with God for which his soul cried out, had become his the moment he believed in Jesus as the Messiah. He now felt that there was not only no longer any condemnation for him, but also that he had become inwardly free from that law of sin in the flesh, which had prevented him from obeying that law of the mind which was a part of his higher nature, and in which he always delighted according to the inner man. His faith in Jesus Christ had procured for him peace with God and peace with himself.

But this faith in Jesus had been hindered for a long time by the offence of the cross. As a pharisee and a Jew he found it difficult to believe in a crucified Messiah. The law had declared "accursed of God every one that hangeth on a tree." (Deut. xxi. 23.) The fact that Jesus had died the ignominious death of the cross was, therefore, to the ordinary Jewish mind, the most infallible proof that He could not have been the promised Messiah. A crucified Messiah was to the Jews a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. Upon this stone Paul had himself for a long time stumbled. This had made him an enemy and a persecutor of the followers of Jesus. And when at last he was arrested in his career of persecution by the crucified but now also exalted and glorified One, and when, after believing in Him, he had found that peace of conscience, which before he had sought in vain, it was natural that his first and profoundest thought should be given to the question as to the meaning of the cross in the economy of human salvation. It was in this way, doubtless, that the death of Christ obtained its transcendent importance for the mind of Paul. The Jew objected to the Messiahship of Jesus on the ground that He had died the accursed death of the cross, and this prejudice Paul himself had once shared. It was, therefore, incumbent upon him to explain the mystery of the cross in such way that to the believer at least it might cease to be an offence, and he explained it by making it the central fact in the process of redemption, or by showing that by means of it only could the redemption of the world be accomplished. If the opponent of Christianity objected to the accursed death of Jesus, Paul answered that "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us." (Gal. iii. 13.) That curse of the law, which the conscientious Jew so much dreaded, was annihilated by the innocent One being, on account of the law, treated as accursed. The suffering and death of Christ was the price which He paid for our redemption. It was, we may say, then, the stress of Jewish controversy that made the cross central in the theology of Paul, and caused him to resolve to know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. We have reason to believe that when

free from the influence of this controversy, he took a larger view of the meaning of Christ and His work. He certainly takes a larger view in the epistles of the captivity, in which the significance of Christ's person is more strongly emphasized. And it is a notable circumstance that at Athens, surrounded by Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, where no cavilling Jews were present, the Apostle preached, not Jesus and Him *crucified*, but Jesus and the *resurrection*; as also subsequently in the first epistle to the Corinthians he laid supreme stress upon the fact of the resurrection. May we not infer from this that, according to circumstances, Paul could vary somewhat his representation of the Gospel, emphasizing now one and then another of its important facts?

Having now seen how Paul came to emphasize so strongly the idea of redemption through the death of Christ, let us, next, try to understand his construction of this idea. To this end we may begin with the passage in Rom. iii. 20-26. In the preceding part of this chapter the Apostle is speaking of the universal need of salvation. The Jews, indeed, had the law; and that would have been an advantage in many respects, if they had kept it; but they kept it not; and, therefore, their own scriptures testify against them, that they are all guilty sinners. In proof of this statement a number of quotations from the Old Testament is presented, vers. 10-18. It follows, therefore, that in the language of Ps. 143:2, no flesh, that is, no living man, can be justified in consequence of the works of the law. The law serves only to bring sin properly into the consciousness and to make us know and feel its culpability. The law only leads to the knowledge of sin, not to righteousness. But now, apart from law, a righteousness of God, typified indeed by the law and predicted by the prophets, has been manifested; which righteousness is realized through faith in Jesus Christ, and may be realized by all believers without distinction of nationality or past relationships. All such distinctions amount to nothing. For all men have sinned and come short of the glory of God; nor can any one save himself by working out a righteousness of

his own according to the precepts of the law. But men are now justified freely, or gratuitously by grace, through the redemption which has been accomplished by Jesus Christ; for Him God has set forth as a means of propitiation, through which sin is made remissible and principally annihilated. And this propitiation is realized subjectively through faith; while objectively it is accomplished by the violent and bloody death of the cross. In this propitiation there is a manifestation or exhibition of God's righteousness. If, in consequence of forbearance with past transgressions, it might have appeared as if God were not righteous, He is now shown to be righteous by this propitiation, or atonement, which takes place in the blood of Jesus; for in this God not only proves Himself to be righteous, but He also shows Himself as making righteous, that is, as acquitting and sanctifying, him who is of faith in Jesus Christ. The atonement or propitiation, here spoken of, is not merely a covering up and concealing of sin from the eye of God, but a breaking of the power of sin in the believer, and the beginning of the moral process of sanctification.

The above we believe to be a fair paraphrase of this difficult passage, whose chief source of difficulty, we think, is in its breviloquence. If we have succeeded approximately in reproducing its meaning as a whole, we may now proceed to study separately its leading conceptions. We observe that *justification* has its ground in *redemption*; for men are *justified freely by grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*. This latter term, then, will demand our first attention. *Redemption*, ἀπολύτρωσις, is *deliverance, liberation*. The primary idea is the notion of deliverance of a prisoner or slave by the payment of a ransom. It is not the idea of transgression or guilt, then, that is implied in the primary notion of redemption, but rather the idea of misfortune and bondage, and the application of the term in the sphere of religious thought can, therefore, not be natural, but only metaphorical. The ἀπολύτρωσις is accomplished by means of a λύτρον, or *ransom*, an idea which is sometimes, though not by Paul, represented by the term ἱλασμός, *propitiation*. But Paul has the kindred adjective ἱλαστήριον, which, however, occurs

nowhere else in his writings, except in our present passage, and but once in the New Testament besides, namely, Heb. ix. 5, where it signifies the lid of the ark of the covenant, the *Kapporeth*, or mercy seat. In this sense the word is used in the Septuagint with the article τὸ ἱλαστήριον, the word ἐπίθεμα being supposed to be understood with it. Some commentators suppose that in our present passage the word is used in this sense, and they would read: "Whom God set forth as a mercy-seat through faith in his blood." So Luther, who translates: *Guadenstuhl*. But it is difficult to see what sense there could be in this. The *Kapporeth* was the place where the blood of atonement was sprinkled in order to cover the sins of Israel in the sight of Jehovah. But how could Christ be said to be sprinkled with His own blood? This interpretation is not now adopted by many. A more common method is to supply θῦμα, *sacrifice*, as the word with which the adjective is supposed to agree. The meaning would, then, be that God set forth Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice through faith in His blood; thus bringing His suffering and death into distinct relation to the sacrificial offerings of the law. To this interpretation, however, it may be objected, that here God is the subject who sets forth Christ in the character of an ἱλαστήριον, while the offerings of the law which are intended to render God propitious, are not set forth by God, but offered by men. But to this it might be replied that the phrase, *God set forth*, contains an allusion to Lev. xvii. 11, where the soul of the atoning sacrifice also is regarded as the gift of God: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and *I have given it to you to make atonement for your souls.*" Though the sacrifice is brought and offered by men, it is in the end only Jehovah's grace that manifests itself in this mode of reconciliation. Prof. Bruce, however, calls attention to the fact that Paul had at this time no great fondness for the ritualism of the Jewish law, and would not have been likely to describe the great conceptions of Christianity in terms of that law.* Many modern expositors take ἱλαστήριον

* *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 167. Bruce refers to Weiss and Pfleiderer as concurring in this opinion.

as a neuter adjective used substantively, and signifying a *means of propitiation*. We hold that the most natural construction is to take *ἱλαστήριον* as a predicative adjective agreeing in gender and case with the preceding relative *ὃν*, and would translate, as the margin of the R. V. suggests: "whom God has set forth to be propitiatory, or as propitiatory." The word *ἱλαστήριος*, *propitiatorius*, has an active signification, signifying the quality of making propitious, rendering favorable, conciliating, reconciling. "*Habens vim propitiandi et expiandi*," says Schleusner, *ad verbum*. Our passage, then, means that Christ has been set forth or given of God as a propitiator, whose propitiating activity consists in the shedding of His blood, by means of which they who believe are reconciled unto God and delivered from the power and curse of sin. In its results this interpretation agrees substantially with that which takes the adjective as a neuter substantive, and defines it as a *means of propitiation*, or a *means of reconciliation*.

But what is the content or meaning of the idea of propitiation? How is Christ in His death a means of reconciliation? Here we at once touch the crucial question in Paul's doctrine of the atonement. Laying stress upon the idea of *λύτρον* in the notion of *ἀπολύτρωσις*, the Greek fathers usually explained the death of Christ as a ransom or price paid to satan, in order to effect a release of the human souls which were justly held in his power. In consequence of sin, it was thought, satan had acquired lawful dominion over the souls of men to torture them at his pleasure; and this dominion could only be broken by offering satan a sufficient ransom. The cross of Christ was that ransom, the precise effect of which was differently explained by different theologians, some supposing it to have been an exact fulfillment of satan's just claims, others regarding it as a species of deception practiced upon the arch-fiend. This view maintained itself with varying fortunes for a thousand years. In the eleventh century, however, this doctrine of atonement was essentially modified by substituting the justice of God for the claims of the devil. Anselm, of Canterbury, was the author of this new theory; and the elements

out of which he constructed it were the notions of Roman and Teutonic law and the penitential system of the Roman Church.

The Roman law yielded the notion of the necessity of satisfaction in order to forgiveness of sin; the Teutonic law suggested the notion that the measure of human guilt is infinite because it is proportionate to the dignity of the person offended; and the penitential system of the church, which allowed the penance imposed upon one person to be performed by another, suggested the thought of substitution.* God is merciful; but he cannot be merciful without the satisfaction of His justice. And as God's justice is infinite, the guilt of sin also must be infinite; and hence an infinite satisfaction must be required. Such a satisfaction is the death of the God-man. The divine nature in Christ imparts to His suffering and death, which he was not bound to

* *Satisfactio* was a familiar term in Roman law, and signified an action by which a legal obligation was discharged without being actually fulfilled. It belonged especially to the sphere of private right. In case of a debt, for example, the person owing it must either pay the amount due, or do something else that will content, *satisfy*, the mind of the creditor. So in the case of an injury the offender must either repair the wrong, or suffer punishment, or do something else that will satisfy the injured party. In some cases an apology would be a sufficient satisfaction. This principle was expressed in the maxim, *aut solvere aut satisfacere*. Satisfaction, then, was not regarded as a legal equivalent of punishment, but rather a compounding of the obligation of punishment. Where satisfaction was made, the obligation to undergo punishment ceased. There was a certain *merit* in the act of satisfaction, which, instead of a reward, the usual correlate of merit, effected the cessation of a legal obligation. In this sense the word came into use in Latin theology from the time of Tertullian onward. For instance, the punishment of sins committed after baptism was believed to be warded off by means of *satisfaction* or penance. This thought lies at the foundation of the penitential system of the Latin Church. In this sense the term *satisfaction* is still used by Anselm. Anselm did not teach that the suffering of Christ was a quantitative equivalent to the suffering of eternal damnation which was due to all men. That is a later notion. What Anselm meant was that the suffering of Christ possessed a merit which could be regarded as a legal substitute for human punishment. On this whole subject see a series of very exhaustive articles by Herman Schultz, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, for 1894, on *Der Sittliche Begriff des Verdienstes und Seine Anwendung auf das Verständniss des Werkes Christi*. Schultz shows that the whole conception of *merit* in the accomplishment of human salvation is unscriptural and unwarranted. The work of Christ is not a legal, but an ethical work.

endure on His own account, an infinite value or merit, which may be set to the account of sinners in order to effect their escape from eternal punishment. In later times, and especially in Protestant theology, the idea of satisfaction came gradually to be understood in the sense of a quantitative legal equivalent to the punishment of human sin. Christ strictly suffered on the cross, as well as before and after, the penalty which was due for the sins of the whole world. According to this theory of atonement, propitiation consists in the vicarious punishment of sin; and Christ is the propitiation because He suffered this punishment. God is rendered propitious, or favorable, because the whole punishment which human sin deserved has been inflicted upon His innocent son. Thus the debt which man owed to the divine justice has been entirely paid.

Much might be said in the way of criticism upon these theories, which must here remain unsaid. The Patristic theory which makes the atonement essentially a transaction with the devil, is dead now; and the vicarious punishment doctrine, both in its Anselmic and in its more modern form, is dying. While still lingering in some traditional dogmatic systems, and in hymns and prayers, the ethical Christian thought of the present time can not appropriate it. But in the way of apology for the long predominance of these theories in theological thought, it is often said that they contain elements of truth which must be recognized and conserved, and that they are, therefore, still worthy of respect. In the former theory, for instance, there is this truth that there is a devil, whose works were destroyed by the manifestation of Christ. And in the latter theory there lies the truth that God is righteous, and that he can not be reconciled to the existence of sin. But surely it boots little for a theory or doctrine that it involves some elements of truth, if that truth is held in unrighteousness. And that this is the case with the Patristic doctrine as well as with the Anselmic, both in its medieval and in its modern form, we think can easily be made manifest by a little more close study of St. Paul.

We would here call attention especially to two points in the

passage under notice. St. Paul says that Christ has been set forth as a means of propitiation *through faith in His blood*. Both of these adjuncts, *through faith*, and *in His blood*, are essential parts of the proposition in which they stand. The proposition, *He was set forth as propitiatory*, is modified by both of these adjuncts. He was set forth in His blood, that is, in His violent death, and He was set forth as propitiatory through faith. Without faith, then, Christ is not a means of propitiation or of reconciliation to the sinner. On the principle of the vicarious punishment doctrine, however, it ought to be otherwise. If Christ made full satisfaction for all human sins, or if He suffered the penalty of all the sins of all men, what reason then is there for demanding faith, or any other condition, in order to participation in the benefit of the atonement? The debt has been paid and the payee has no right to demand any further conditions of the debtor. A creditor who should undertake to do that would be declared unreasonable and unjust by every legal tribunal in the world. But again Paul says that Christ was thus set forth as a propitiation *in order to the manifestation of God's righteousness*. Had there been no such sacrifice made, then the announcement of the forgiveness of sins, and even the idea of forgiveness as a spontaneous suggestion of the human heart apart from any special revelation, would have appeared to indicate that God is not righteous, but that He is indifferent to sin. But the sacrifice of the cross is a manifestation of His righteousness. How, then, is the righteousness of God manifested thereby? Is it by the imposition of the sins of the guilty upon the innocent one, and by punishing the latter in the stead of the former? Would that be a display of righteousness? Suppose a human tribunal should consciously and deliberately propose to crucify an innocent man in place of a guilty one. How would that accord with the idea of justice?

But we are told sometimes that we must not judge God's righteousness by any human standard. God's righteousness, it is said, may be different from our righteousness, even as His thoughts are different from our thoughts. But this is a kind of

obscurantism that throws all moral thought into confusion. If God's sense of right could be supposed to be essentially different from our sense of right; if, for example, He could be supposed to regard as right the deliberate punishment of an innocent person instead of the guilty, then there would be an end to all moral thought. Our moral ideas derive the guarantee of their objective reality and permanence only from the supposition that they have their foundation in God, and that they are a reflection of God's moral nature. And when Paul speaks of the manifestation of God's righteousness, that must surely mean such an exhibition of His conduct as shall commend itself to our sense of right. There could be no manifestation of righteousness, if what is manifested were not seen and felt to be right. And here we venture the assertion that, if it were not for the influence of long and venerable tradition, no Christian man would now consider as right and just such an arrangement as that which the Anselmic theory supposes, either in its medieval or in its sixteenth and seventeenth century sense. In religion and theology we are very much what our inheritance and environment make of us. The notions and dogmas which come to us from the past are for us sacred things, just because they are connected with the religion which we inherit from the past; and because they are sacred we refuse to analyze them, and to recognize in them any contradiction with the ideas which the progress of religious thought has produced. It is in this way that all historical religions come to contain ideas that are no longer intelligible to existing generations. We believe that the doctrine of vicarious punishment is an eminent illustration of this truth. In our time a soul naturally Christian, and not influenced by any traditional theology, would never suppose that there was any manifestation of righteousness in the infliction of pain upon an innocent person on account of other people's guilt. On the contrary this would be regarded as being itself an act of the greatest injustice.

And this theory is not materially helped by the notion of a voluntary assumption of human guilt on the part of Jesus, and a voluntary endurance of the penalty thereof. It is sometimes

said: "Certainly, the punishment of an innocent person in the place of the guilty would be wrong. It would be wrong to say that God laid upon Jesus the sins of the world and punished Him on their account. But may not an innocent person assume the sins of the guilty, and bear their penalty? May not one man pay another man's debt in bank, and so free the debtor from his obligation? May not, moreover, one person freely undergo suffering for the sake of another; as, for instance, when a wife clings to an unworthy husband, and shares with him the consequences of his life of sin, or when a father suffers for the sins of a rebellious son?" Yes, *only this is not suffering punishment*. To suppose that the vicarious payment of a debt, or the vicarious suffering of pain, is equivalent to the idea of vicarious punishment, is totally to confound the ideas of physical and ethical relations. Sin and guilt are not things that can be transferred from one person to another, any more than moral goodness can be so transferred. Nor can one person assume another's guilt. Suppose that after the conviction of a criminal in a court of justice, an innocent person were to step forward and say: "I take upon me that man's guilt; please consider me guilty and punish me in his stead." Would such vicarious punishment make the criminal any the less guilty? Would it free his conscience from the sense of guilt to see any one else suffering in his stead? There is doubtless much vicarious suffering in the world, and this fact presents one of the hard questions to the student of theodicy. We see children suffering in consequence of the sins of parents and parents in consequence of the sins of children. We see the best men suffering on account of the sins of the worst. No great moral work can be accomplished without suffering and death. The man who would redeem and elevate his people, must usually offer his life as a sacrifice to his undertaking. Why this is so we may perhaps never be able to understand. We can only remember that the essence of God's ways in the world is love and that sacrifice is of the essence of love. But there is one thing plain in all the vicarious sacrifice and suffering which we behold, and that is that it is not in any proper sense punishment; for

the innocent sufferer can never suffer with the same conscience as the guilty. Punishment implies guilt, and no innocent person can ever accept another's guilt and make it his own in such sense as to be able to suffer the punishment thereof. The physical pain he might undergo, but the tormenting sense of conscience he could not share, and it is only this that makes suffering to be really punishment. No innocent sufferer can ever feel guilty of another person's sins; nor can such suffering ever relieve or diminish another's guilt. The only way in which the guilt of another person could be assumed, would be *to will his sins*. That would create a communion of guilt, but the ground of this communion would be the bad will of each person and both would be alike personally guilty. But, certainly, no one will imagine that Christ assumed the sins of the world in this sense, which is the only sense in which the assumption of sin is a possibility.

It was, then, not in the sense of having suffered the penalty of the world's guilt, or a legal equivalent thereof, that Paul could have thought of Christ as a means of reconciliation. But to have shown that this explanation of Paul's language is not correct, is not yet to have explained his meaning; although something has been gained if an inveterate misunderstanding has been cleared out of the way. Let us, then, see whether from Paul's unconventional and popular use of language we can construct a consistent conception of his doctrine of redemption. What, then, was his precise notion of *propitiation*? Certainly he thinks of it as of something by which man is brought into favorable relation to God. To propitiate means to obtain favor, to avert displeasure and secure good will—to *make atonement*. And to make atonement is to remove the obstacle to peace and unity between persons and establish friendship between them. What, then, was the obstacle to *at-one-ment*, or reconciliation, between God and man, which the sacrifice of Christ removed? Was it any disinclination on the part of God to be well disposed toward men, or was it a disinclination on the part of men to be well disposed towards God? Manifestly not the former, for the atonement, according to Paul's representation, proceeded from God. It was

He that set forth His Son. The propitiation was not anything by which God's love or good will towards man was procured. On the contrary it was itself the result of that good will. It was *because* God loved man, that He set forth His Son as a propitiation; as according to the Gospel of John also the love of God is the motive of the gift of His Son. The propitiation, then, did not consist in offering to God something by which His wrath was appeased and His justice satisfied. So much is involved in the proposition that "God set forth His Son as a propitiation."

With this conclusion agrees the passage in Rom. v. 6-10. In the preceding verses of this chapter the Apostle speaks of the peace with God which comes from justification by faith, of the joyful sense of blessedness which lifts the believer above the depressing influences of life's misfortunes, and of the love of God which, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, is realized in the hearts of believers; and then he continues: "For while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will any one die; though perchance for a good man some one may indeed be willing to die. But God commendeth His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified in His blood, shall we be saved from the wrath through Him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled shall we be saved through His life." Here it is plainly stated that the death of Christ was not the procuring cause, but the effect of God's love. Christ died for us, not in order to make God love us, but because God did love us. The formal relation of the death of Christ to the sinner is in this passage, as always in the writings of Paul, expressed by means of the preposition *ὑπέρ*, which with the genitive signifies participation and benefit, not substitution. The idea of substitution would require *ἀντί*, which is never used in connection with the saving work of Christ except once, namely in Matt. xx. 28, and in the parallel passage, Mark x. 45, where, however, the object is not sin or punishment, but men, "the many." When it is said that Christ died *for us*,

that means, not that He died in our stead in a legal sense, but that He died for our benefit. And that benefit, according to Paul in this passage, is that *we are saved from the wrath*. The Apostle does not say *wrath of God*, perhaps because in a passage in which the whole work of salvation is traced to the divine love as its principle, that would have been incongruous. In i. 18, however, the wrath of God is spoken of, and is said to be poured out upon all ungodliness of men. But this simply means the misery which, in consequence of the righteous world-order founded in the nature of God, is the inevitable penalty of sin, and which cannot be escaped by any legal arrangement or fiction, but only by a real conformity of life and conduct with the principle of divine righteousness. We are not saved from the misery of sin by another's having borne that misery, but by His having annihilated the power of sin in us.

That this is the meaning of salvation, in Paul's view, will further appear from the fact that, according to the passage now under consideration, the *enmity* which was removed by the death of Christ, existed not on the part of God but on the part of man. The Apostle says that, "we being enemies, *ἐχθροί*, were reconciled unto God by the death of His Son." We are aware that the word *ἐχθρός* has a double meaning, an active and a passive. Sometimes it expresses the idea of *hating*, and sometimes the idea of *being hated*. My *ἐχθρός* may be the man who hates me, or he may be the man whom I hate. In Rom. xi. 28, the word seems to be used in the latter sense, being opposed to *ἀγαπητός*, *beloved*. Here the Jews are said to be *ἐχθροί*, *hated*, as touching the Gospel, for the sake of the Gentiles. But this is the only passage in the New Testament in which the word seems to be used in this sense. In Col. i. 21 the Gentiles are described as having been in times past alienated and *enemies* in their minds in evil works. That this active sense is the sense in which the word is used in our present passage is apparent from the fact that the goal of the reconciliation is God. We as enemies were reconciled to God, who never was our enemy. The propitiation was not something that changed God's mind towards us, but something

that changed our minds towards God. It broke down the enmity of the carnal mind (for the mind of the flesh is enmity against God, Rom. viii. 7), and with that also the law of sin in the members, setting the sinner free from the dominion of sin. This is the idea of that ἀπολύτρωσις, or *redemption*, which is the effect of the propitiation. For while ἀπολύτρωσις involves as a consequence the *forgiveness* of sins (Cf. Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14), it is in its own essence deliverance from the external and internal power of sin; for in Gal. i. 4 it is said that "Christ gave Himself for (περί) our sins that He might deliver us from this present evil world; and in Tit. ii. 14, that He gave Himself for (ὅπερ) us, in order that He might deliver us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works."

What, then, is the atonement according to Paul? It is the bringing of the human will into union with the will of God. It is the breaking of the power of sin in man, in consequence of which the sinner comes to be in a friendly state of mind towards God, and able to fulfill the demands of God's holy law. This is in accordance with the teaching in Rom. iii. 26, where it is said that the end of the atoning act, the setting forth of Christ as a propitiation, is that God may be just and the justifier of him that is of the faith of Jesus. Here evidently the atonement is not regarded as a device by which God, without infraction of His own righteousness, may treat the unrighteous sinner as righteous. The meaning is that God may not only be shown to be righteous Himself, but also as making righteous him that is connected by faith with Jesus, δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ; where δικαιοῦντα, while including, evidently means more than the idea of *declaring righteous*. It means the induction in the sinner of that quality of the divine being which is expressed by the term δικαιούνη. This is evidently the thought contained in Rom. viii. 1-5. "There is, therefore, no condemnation," it is here said, "to them who are in Christ Jesus." Why not? "Because the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed them from the law of sin and death." The law of sin, which leads to death, is

the impulse to sinful acts which is inherent now in human nature. This law of sin could not be broken by the legal system of Judaism. But that which the Jewish law could not accomplish, being rendered impotent through the flesh which it could not control, that God has accomplished by sending His own Son not *in* sinful flesh, but in the *likeness* of sinful flesh and condemning sin in the flesh, in order that the just requirement of the law, *δεξαίωμα*, may be fulfilled in them who walk not in the flesh but in the spirit. The atonement accomplished by the death of Christ, then, is not an arrangement by which sinners may be saved without the fulfillment of the law in its ethical nature, but a means by which the fulfillment of the law may be secured. And this shows that what is said of God's condemning sin in the flesh can not mean a vicarious punishment, or a legal satisfaction by means of a meritorious performance, but such a judgment of sin as secures its own destruction. What God has done is that He has pronounced judgment upon sin in such way as to bring about its annihilation in men's souls, somewhat as the curse of Jesus brought about the destruction of the barren fig-tree.

St. Paul looked upon the death of Christ somehow as bearing a causal relation to the annihilation of the law of sin in human nature. By the death of Christ the soul that is of faith in Him, has been in principle severed from sin. It has come to stand in the same relation to sin in which one stands to something from which he has been separated by death. In Chap. vii. 1-6, the Apostle illustrates the separating, absolving power of death by its breaking up of the marriage bond. There is a law binding a wife to her husband so long as the latter lives. This law is dissolved by the death of the husband, and the wife is then no longer bound by its conditions. Now the death of Christ effects a similar liberation of the believer from the law which works sin and death. "So, my brethren, ye also have died unto the law through the body of Christ, to the end that ye should belong to another, even to Him who was raised from the dead, that we may bear fruit unto God." The Apostle says of Christ Himself that,

"in that He died, He died unto sin once; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God," Rom. vi. 10. How could Christ be said to have died unto sin? Not in the sense that He endured the penalty of its guilt, but in the sense that it ceased to have any existence for Him. During His earthly life He was continually brought into relation to sin. He experienced its tempting and its persecuting power. In the beginning He was tempted to be a Messiah in the carnal sense of His Jewish contemporaries. That was the form in which sin assailed Him. He resisted its assault in that form, and then the assault changed into violence. If the offer of a crown did not tempt Him, the exhibition of the cross might. But He endured the cross; and henceforth sin had no more power over Him. "He that has died is freed from sin," Rom. vi. 7. This is the ethical explanation of the death of Christ, which we also meet with in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Cf. Heb. ii. 10, and v. 8. But the death of Christ as an ethical transaction, wherein His renunciation of sin, both in its tempting and in its threatening aspects, was forever sealed, and His own character made perfect, was not according to Paul, an event in which He alone was interested. It was an event in which somehow the whole race was involved, and therefore the counterpart of Adam's transgression in Paradise. It was the one act of obedience on the part of the Second Adam by which the many shall be made righteous; as by the one act of disobedience on the part of the first Adam the many were made sinners, Rom. v. 19.

That this is the meaning of Christ's death, according to the teaching of St. Paul, may be made to appear from some other passages in his writings. Take, for example, 2 Cor. v. 14: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we judge thus, that one died for all, therefore *all died*." *Οι πάντες ἀπέθανον*. This sentence reminds us of that in Rom. v. 12: *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*. Here, as there, the verb is in the aorist tense, denoting a momentary act completed at some definite time in the past. They all sinned, once for all, at some time in the past, namely, at the time of Adam's transgression. So all died once for all, in

the death of Christ. And this death is ethically a death unto sin, both for Christ and for all—a death unto sin in the sense that the power of sin has been broken, and that the moral tendency in human nature has been in principle reversed, the spiritual element having gained the ascendancy over the carnal. This, however, is not to be understood in the sense that it is no longer possible for individuals to sin, but in the sense that it is possible for them not to sin, and that the main tendency of their moral being is no longer evil but good. As in the natural state of the soul there is liberty of choice, or moral freedom, so that men sin not of necessity, but are capable among particular acts to choose the good; so also in the Christian state the power of self-determination not only remains, but is strengthened, and the individual is not compelled to live unto Christ, but may continue to live unto his carnal self. Where, however, the grace or power of Christ's death abounding in the life of humanity is appropriated by the individual will, there the law of sin in the members is actually slain, and the man lives according to Christ in newness of life. Thus Paul says, Gal. ii. 20, "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." *Crucified with Christ*—that means that the crucifixion of Christ was not a legal transaction apart from the sinner and in the sinner's stead, but a transaction in which the sinner himself was essentially involved, so that his moral and spiritual life was thereby renewed according to the law of Christ. It is in this way that, through the atonement of Christ, God proves Himself not only just, but also the justifier of those who believe in Jesus. The righteousness, which God in this way manifests, does not consist in accepting the merits of another in behalf of the sinner, but in imparting to the latter His own righteous character, His *δικαιοσύνη*.

This, however, leads us to Paul's doctrine of *justification*, which we do not propose to take up at present. But there remains still one question in regard to the doctrine of redemp-

tion, which may claim a moment's attention. We have seen that, according to Paul, redemption consists in deliverance from the guilt and power of sin through the sacrificial death of Christ. We have also seen that his conception of the connection between redemption and the sacrifice of Christ was not the notion of a meritorious satisfaction or of a vicarious punishment. What, then, was Paul's idea of this connection? In other words, what was his *theory* of the atonement? Did he have a theory? The epistle to the Romans, the epistle in which he develops most fully his doctrine of sin and redemption, certainly contains no such theory. The presumption, therefore, is that he had no formal theory, or philosophy of the subject, in his own mind. He accepted the fact. It was for him a fact of experience that we are reconciled to God through the death of His son, and saved in His life. And this fact he constantly opposed to the notion of salvation by the ceremonies of the law. If the Jew hoped to be saved by means of priesthood, altar, or sacrifice; Paul said, Christ is for us all that you think you have in your legal institutions, without meaning thereby to bring the work of Christ under the scheme of the law. He never asks the question, how the death of Christ comes to exercise its redeeming power. If he ever speculated upon this question, he has nowhere given us the results of such speculation.

But do not the apostle's statements involve a theory; and may we not by closely scrutinizing them detect his principles and formulate them into a consistent rational doctrine? This has been the usual supposition, and theologians have generally acted in accordance with it. Taking together what was believed to be the teaching of Paul and of all the writers of the New Testament, they have sought to evolve a philosophical doctrine or theory of the atonement. But how difficult this task is, may be seen from the variety of theories that has resulted. If the statements of Scripture were plain statements of rational truths, whence then is this variety of theories? And which of these theories would Paul have accepted as his own? We have already seen reasons to believe that he would not have accepted the theory of meri-

torious satisfaction or substitutionary punishment. If that theory had been stated to him, he would probably not have understood it; and if he had understood it, he would have rejected it with horror as reflecting dishonor upon the character of God. And the *governmental theory*, which is only a modification of the theory of vicarious punishment, would have received no more favor. Nor is it likely that the so-called *moral influence* theory would have been acceptable to the Apostle. His mystical conception of the union of men with Christ in His death would have prevented him from accepting a theory which makes the whole value of that death to consist in its spectacular influence upon men's minds. Paul would doubtless have admitted such an influence; but he would not have been willing to believe that the whole efficacy of Christ's suffering and death consists in this influence.

Some have taken the ground that no theory of the atonement is possible. The reserve of St. Paul and of the other writers of the New Testament is regarded as a warning to us, that, when we attempt the construction of a rational theory of the atonement, we transcend the limits of our intellectual powers. It is a moral reality with which we have here to do and, therefore, no merely theoretical judgments can ever be an adequate expression of it. Lotze, for example, writes: "He who in an unprejudiced way, allows the teaching of Christ and the history of Christ's life to influence his mind without analyzing this impression, may be convinced that an infinitely valuable and unique act has occurred here on earth for the salvation of humanity. But the attempts to settle speculatively the content and value of this fact, do not, as a whole, lead to the end designed."* With this conclusion the adherents of the school of Ritschl would generally agree. Their theory of knowledge, which makes all knowledge merely phenomenal and removes the metaphenomenal beyond the reach of the human faculties, would favor the idea that such a fact as the atonement must be forever an insoluble mystery. Now it must be admitted, of course, that the power of the human mind

* *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 151.

has its limitations. There are many things of which we can form no mental image, and there are even things of which we can form no conception in thought. For instance, we can form no conception of the origination of matter, and Lotze warns us continually that we cannot understand how existence is made. But it is true also that the apparent limits of human thought are continually receding farther and farther into the distance and that men will always continue to speculate even in regard to the profoundest subjects of religion. Is this speculation to be forever doomed to fruitlessness? We can not think so. If religion is real, then it must be rational. The fact that its leading conceptions are moral conceptions, does not remove it from the domain of rationality, and the human mind must be capable at last of discovering its ultimate rational principles. We believe, therefore, that rational speculation on the doctrine of the atonement is legitimate and will at last lead to relatively satisfactory results. We now see through a glass darkly, but we expect sometime to be able to see face to face. But in order to this end speculation must be free. The speculation of one age cannot suffer itself to be bound by the speculation of any previous age. If Anselm could be allowed to formulate a new theory of the atonement in the eleventh century, there is no reason why later thinkers should not have the same liberty. But in all such efforts it is important to bear in mind that the conclusions reached are not identical with the facts of Scripture. No theory can pretend to be the very teaching of Scripture itself, but only a more or less rational explanation of that teaching; while all that is necessary to Christian living is a cordial acceptance of the facts of revelation as they are contained in the New Testament and reflected in the fundamental Christian creed.

VII.

RICHES AND POVERTY.

BY REV. D. B. LADY, D.D.

There are, in this free country of ours, some very wealthy men. They have more money than they need. All their legitimate wants are fully supplied, and they are able to spend large sums of money for luxuries. They live in palaces. They possess books and pictures and statuary. They enjoy the privileges of foreign travel under most favorable conditions. They are able to give their children the finest clothing, the wholesomest food, the best education, the most thorough culture, and an advantageous start in the competition of life. And they see their store increasing in spite of all their expenditures. They are compelled to seek new investments; they are under the necessity of looking for fresh sources of enjoyment that the accumulating income may be spent. These are "the favored few for whose benefit the world seems hitherto to have framed its institutions."

The large majority of men are not so fortunate. Some enjoy a moderate prosperity. Others find it a hard and exhausting struggle to procure food and clothing and shelter for themselves and their dependents. They have absolutely no prospect of improving their condition, or contributing to its improvement in the next generation. There are multitudes who seem doomed, under present conditions, to spend their lives in the severest labor and the most abject poverty. The common workman in the mill or mine earns but a pittance, and lives in a hovel, and subsists on the coarsest food, and during a strike or a shut-down, brought about by over production, business depression, a disagreement with his employer, or an economical blunder by the National Legislature, he is on the brink of starvation, and often only keeps body and soul together by begging from door to door of those just one or two degrees more fortunate than he is. Then

there is the tramp, covered with filth, clothed in rags, without shelter or home or family ties, a moral and social wreck, drifting on the uncertain currents of reluctant charity, doled out in the form of cold victuals and cast-off clothing in life, dying unattended and filling a nameless grave after life's hardships and horrors are over.

It is estimated by good authorities that "the average annual income of the 100 richest Americans cannot be less than \$1,200,000 and probably exceeds \$1,500,000." Says Dr. Strong: "If 100 workmen could earn \$1,000 a year they would have to work 1,200 to 1,500 years to earn as much as the annual income of these 100 richest Americans. And if a workingman could earn \$1,000 a day he would have to work until he was 547 years old and never take a day off, before he could earn as much as some Americans are worth. * * Three-tenths of one per cent. of our population control seventy per cent. of our property. In other words, in the distribution of the national wealth, one man out of three hundred receives \$70, and 299 men receive the other \$30, which if averaged would give them about ten cents each."—*The New Era*, pp. 151, 152.

And there can hardly be any question but that these inequalities are increasing. The rich are becoming richer, whilst there is no proportionate increase in their number. The poor are growing poorer, and they multiply upon the face of the earth. Several non-speculative estates in New York have increased five-fold in less than forty years. The steady increment in the value of city lands added to the rent of the property has brought this about. Mr. Thos. G. Shearman thinks that the American billionaire may be reasonably looked for within the next half century. Over against this may be set an extract from the *Greenville Argus* under date of April 8, 1897. "A woman in Annville, Lebanon county, Pa., has kept strict account of tramps fed at her back door for one year. During that time she answered no less than 419 calls of this sort." The writer adds: "Many a Greenville matron equals this record, and the evil is growing worse instead of better."

What is the reason of this state of things? This is one of the burning questions of the day. And it is not a sufficient answer to say that wealth has always been more or less unequally distributed among men, and that even the Bible says: "the rich and the poor meet together and the Lord is the maker of them all," that it cannot be helped, and that, according to Shakespeare, "things without remedy should be without regard." The men of this age are disposed to inquire into the righteousness and legitimacy of excessive wealth and poverty. They are convinced that the "times are out of joint," that conditions are abnormal, and however venerable the disease, they are looking for a cure. They feel that it is incumbent upon every age of the world to look boldly into the face of the evils peculiar to its civilization, and to endeavor to find a remedy for the wrong and suffering which it has entailed upon men. A free inquiry into what we see about us, an outspoken opinion of its righteousness or wrong, and an honest and persistent attempt to right the wrong when it is discovered, is always in order in a republic, where the people are the source of power, and where all citizens take part in electing those who make and administer the laws and shape the course of economic and public affairs. Why then are some men excessively rich and others extremely poor?

Men become wealthy because they are industrious and economical, because of special advantages and opportunities inherited or acquired, because they exercise great energy or are endowed with extraordinary capacity, or are very specially adapted to some line of work for which a market exists or may be created. "Many rich men render services of very exceptional value to society by means of their exceptional executive abilities, which services deserve and obtain a high reward." There are those who have a genius for literary composition, for useful inventions, for statesmanship or for military affairs. So there are those who have a genius for accumulating wealth. They possess the Midas touch, which turns everything it comes in contact with into gold. That such men are often lacking in intellectual and moral culture, that they are narrow and selfish and cruel, does not alter the fact that

they can make money. It should not be thought strange that a race which produced a Shakespeare, a Newton, a Napoleon, and a Bismark, should also give the world a Rothschild, or that a country which numbers among its notable men an Edison and a Grant should also contain a Gould, a Rockefeller and a Carnegie. As there are great leaders in art, war and government, so there are great leaders in industry, in the organization of vast combinations for the manipulation of money, for the production, transportation or distribution of the necessities of life. And as such genius is employed and as such combinations are found and carried on, for the most part, for purposes of gain, many of these men succeed in enriching themselves in the most wonderful manner.

On the other hand, men remain poor or become poor because of laziness, carelessness, wastefulness, improvidence, immorality and incapacity. It is an old law that if a man will not work neither shall he eat. To spend time and energy in the service of sin is a sure way to bring disaster and failure in life. "One vice is more expensive than ten virtues." We may go further than this and say that whilst virtue is one of the foundations of success, vice frequently results in ruin. To employ time and strength in drunkenness is to waste them. To use money in the pursuit and practice of any form of ungodliness is worse than throwing it away. "One can't eat his cake and have it too." Slothful men, men of degraded tastes and vicious habits, come to want. They misuse life's opportunities carelessly and foolishly. They ruin themselves. They squander their property, beggar their children, and deprive themselves and those dependent upon them of the prospect of improvement, and thus take away the incentive to exertion which hope and confidence in the future are accustomed to provide.

There are many men also who miss their calling in life. Their early predilection for a particular career is not sufficiently strong to indicate what they are best fitted for, and they fall into a groove to which they cannot adjust themselves. They miss their chance of success because they are able to do but indifferently

what they have undertaken to do. There are others who do not seem to be adapted to anything. There is no place in the organization of the world's enterprises to which they belong. They can neither find nor make a field of activity for themselves apparently. Their exertions end in disappointment and failure. They contribute nothing to the world's progress. They are of no benefit to the human race, and none of the rewards of successful service come to them. Neither they nor others get any good from what they do. They often end by becoming a burden to their friends or to the community. They crowd our almshouses. They fill our pauper graves.

And who can find fault with these things? It would certainly be unwise and unjust, if it were even possible, to arrange society upon such principles and govern it by such laws as would secure equal prosperity to the virtuous and the vicious, the diligent and the sluggard, the man of a hundred talents and the man of no talents. If the most pitiful and loving and righteous man that ever lived had the power given him of creating a world and filling it with human beings such as we are he would certainly not make it any different in these respects from that which the Almighty has made. It is right that industry and economy should be rewarded, that application and skill and genius, employed with good judgment in the service of mankind, should meet with recognition and success. A world constructed on any other principles and laws would be a world constructed without love or justice. It would be much harder to live in than this world, and would probably not be able to maintain itself for many years. We can not alter the inequalities of men's condition in life, so glaring in their apparent injustice, and stirring our hearts with such pity for the unfortunate as they do, by attempting to reverse the laws of nature by means of human legislation. Anything which sets aside fair play for those who under present conditions become rich, as well as for those who seem doomed to hopeless poverty, is sure to end in failure and in worse evils than those we would seek to avoid. All men must be left free. All are equally entitled to an unobstructed course in the pursuit of

prosperity. The laws must be so framed and the government so administered as to secure this to them.

But so much having been said and admitted, the discussion is not ended. There is much poverty in the world which does not result from any defect, avoidable or unavoidable, in those who suffer from it. There is much prosperity among men which cannot be fairly attributed to the industry, economy, superior endowments or attainments or virtues or services of those who enjoy it. There are the poor who have in no way brought poverty upon themselves, and the rich who do not deserve to be rich. The question is not, why should vice and incompetence be followed by failure, and virtue and great talents and faithful and persevering effort result in success. Every thinking and just man is satisfied with that. But the question is, of a hundred men, equally deserving, why should money, high place, social advancement, culture, the prizes and advantages of life, come to one and not to all. Why should there be among men an aristocracy, other than that of high character or distinguished service, a privileged few elevated, for no merit of their own, far above the common herd. Why does the language need such words as the classes and the masses? Assuming that there is enough money in the world, and enough of that which money can buy, to make the whole race comfortable, why should a favored few have far more than sufficient for their wants and others, a multitude which no man can number, live through years made wretched for want of what the more fortunate could spare, and that for no cause for which they can be held justly responsible?

We take a few extracts from Strong's *New Era*: "There are 1,103 millionaires in New York City worth from one to one hundred and fifty millions." "There is a growing class of idle rich whose only business is their own amusement, and who, though they toil not, neither do they spin, yet rank Solomon himself in luxury." In Boston "there is a fruit market which has existed for thirty years upon the whims of the rich. Hamburg grapes at ten dollars a pound are regularly in stock. In winter, strawberries and asparagus sell easily at three dollars a

box or a bunch. When the first Florida berries come, thirteen in a cup, at four dollars a cup, parties are supplied. One hundred and twenty-five dollars' worth of fruit to a single order causes the dealer no surprise."

In the "sweat-shops" of the same cultured city there are women who earn sixty cents by sewing sixteen or seventeen hours a day. One woman makes cheap overcoats at four cents apiece; another knee-pants for boys at sixteen cents a dozen. There are women in Chicago who make twelve shirts for seventy-five cents and furnish their own thread, and others who work four hours for six cents. "The workingman finds his labor rated as a commodity whose price is determined solely by the law of supply and demand." "Such men have often to beg for work, and are treated as if they were asking for favors. In the winter time, when the uncertainty of getting work becomes the certainty of not getting it, in our great industrial cities, things are at their worst. After having vainly trudged from workshop to workshop, from factory to factory, from wharf to wharf; after having perhaps fought fiercely but unsuccessfully for a few hours' work at the dock gates, the man returns home, weary, hungry, half dead and ashamed of his growing raggedness, to see his home without fire or food, perhaps to go to bed in order to try and forget the misery around him."

Last winter the Pennsylvania Legislature sent a committee to the western part of the State to investigate the condition of the bituminous coal miners. The committee was accompanied by reporters for the Pittsburgh papers. Here is a specimen of what they found, as given by one such reporter. "The first sight that met the eyes of the committee was a long row of narrow one-story frame shanties occupied by Polish and Slavonic miners' families. In each of the miserable hovels was one woman and from three to ten men. Every house rented for, at least, \$6, and in those where more than six men resided the rent increased \$1 per month for each man. The houses were not plastered or lined and were built over swamps. In the rear of this row were a number of larger houses which rented for from \$7 to \$10 a month.

The sanitary conditions were terrible. All offal, filth and refuse was deposited in the road in front of the houses and the stench arising therefrom was simply unbearable. One woman said she had lost two children with fever since living there and herself and husband had both been sick several times. They are anxious to get away, but cannot get enough money ahead, on account of work being so poor."

The lot of these men is a very hard one. Many of the common laborers in the mines and manufactories of this section of the country work for from 90 cents to \$1.30 a day and pay from \$60 to \$100 a year house-rent, and large numbers of them are frequently out of work. They cannot support their families in any sort of decency or comfort. And it is not a question of vice or improvidence here. Most of these men are sober, industrious, economical and without bad habits. They are compelled to be or they would starve. Their only luxury is smoking, and poverty forces them to use a brand of tobacco, a little of which goes a great way. They drink beer occasionally. There is all the more reason why those more prosperous and of superior moral culture should set them an example of total abstinence and labor earnestly for the success of the prohibition cause.

And the farmers will soon be in as bad a condition as the mine and mill and "sweat-shop" laborers. There has been for a number of years a steady decline in the value of agricultural lands and of farm products. "Many farms in New England can be bought for less than the cost of the buildings and walls on them." "Governor Foraker said in 1887, that farm property in Ohio was then from 25 to 50 per cent. cheaper than it was in 1880. During the same time the value of agricultural land in the ten cotton states declined \$459,000,000, or thirty-one per cent." It is the same in Europe. "The wealth of Great Britain has more than doubled since 1840, but there has been a decline of £138,000,000 in the value of the lands. In France the peasant proprietors have ceased to buy land and are anxious to sell it; and in the department of Aisne, one of the richest in France, one tenth of the land is abandoned, because the sale of produce does not cover the

expense of cultivation. In Russia there are 80,000 beggars who, once land owners, have surrendered their land, because the cost of ownership was greater than the profits of cultivation." (*New Era*, pp. 156, 157.) In western Pennsylvania, within hearing of the locomotive whistles of four important railroads, before Easter this year, eggs were selling at 8 cents a dozen, butter at 14 cents a pound, potatoes and corn at 15 cents a bushel and oats at 18 cents a bushel. By the 1st of May potatoes had gone to 12 cents a bushel, and by June 1st butter was selling at 8 cents a pound. Other farm products brought corresponding prices, about one half of what was obtained for them a few years ago. To pay taxes, support the church, keep up farm repairs, and feed and clothe their families, is all that the most prosperous farmers can do. Those who pay rent or farm on shares or carry a mortgage are not making ends meet. Bankruptcy is staring them in the face. Their going under is only a question of time. And not only the bone and sinew, but much of the virtue and character of the nation is found among these people. The writer is disposed always to look at the bright side of things. But contact with these conditions turns the sunniest optimism into the most despondent pessimism.

And what kind of men grow wealthy in our day, for the most part? Is it the fascinating writer, the eloquent orator, the ingenious inventor, the learned scientist, the skillful general, the wise statesman that becomes the multi-millionaire? The user of slang would reply: "I should smile." It is the corporation lawyer, the corrupt legislator, the distiller or brewer and wholesale dispenser of intoxicants, the oil magnate who monopolizes the business, crowding small producers and refiners to the wall and then buying and selling at his own figures; it is the manager and large stockholder in the syndicate, the pool or the trust, the railroad wrecker, the man who engineers successive corners in the securities of a great corporation, or in the necessities of life, who sometimes adds a million dollars to his fortune in a single transaction. Take an extract from the "Pittsburg Post." It occurs in a series of reports of the transactions of a committee

of the New York Legislature ordered to investigate trusts. It appears under date of February 27th. It says: "The tobacco trust has been a daisy. It was organized with a capital stock of \$10,000,000, which has since been increased to \$35,000,000. The total paid for live assets was \$5,000,000. The rest is water. And on this dividends are paid at the rate of 12 and 15 per cent. on the common and preferred stocks. This has been going on since 1890, with the addition of a total surplus last year of \$8,000,000. In the great fluctuations of 1896 the stock fell from 117 to 63, notwithstanding dividends and surplus. It is suggested that those on the inside sold out at 117 and bought back at 63. At the outset there were less than 50 stockholders, while at this time there are about 3,000. That is the way to make money."

But whilst it may be an example of the way money is made by many of those who become millionaires, it is certainly no way to make money honestly and fairly. For what goes into the long purses of the wealthy by these methods comes largely out of the meagre incomes of the poor. And there is, or soon will be, a trust in every important necessary of life. There is, or was lately, a steel trust. There is a sugar trust, a lumber trust, an oil trust, a leather trust, a bicycle trust. And there are those who are so uncharitable as to say that there are *steal* trusts too.

It is not pretended to argue that combinations of capital, entered into with a good object, skilfully directed, honestly and wisely administered for the public good, could not be, or have not been, of vast benefit to the country and to its citizens, whilst yielding a fair profit upon the money, skill and energy invested in them. They have contributed very largely to the development of the material resources of the country and have added much to the wealth and comfort of the people. They are not in themselves either economically or morally wrong. They belong to our age and he who advocates their abolition writes himself down a short-sighted statesman. The employment of steam and the most powerful machinery in manufacture, a good banking and credit system, rapid transportation and almost instantaneous communi-

cation by means of the magnetic telegraph, make them possible and necessary. We could not get along without them. To attempt to do so would be to take many steps backward and would be extremely foolish. They should be encouraged in right courses. They deserve praise and support for the good they do.

But when these combinations in the hands of unscrupulous and self-seeking men, because the opportunity to do so is presented and they have the power, make it their aim to crush out competition, drive rivals to the wall, exact enormous profits on the necessities of life, control elections, corrupt statesmen, dictate laws to the legislatures and to Congress, secure the enactment of prohibitive duties upon imports, thus making foreign competition impossible and force a contraction of the currency upon the nation, then it is evident that they care nothing for the public good, but exist only to enrich themselves and that they have become the tyrants and slave holders of the day, more cruel and unfeeling toward the poor than were the robber barons of William the Conqueror to their subject Saxons in England or the aristocrats of the South before the war to the helpless negroes who were their slaves.

But injustice and wrongdoing are not peculiar to the rich, nor are righteousness and virtue found only among the poor! Most certainly not. The doctrine of total depravity is of universal application. The rich only live up to it more fully than the poor because they have larger opportunities for doing so. The men who rose to power in the French revolution were more tyrannical and bloodthirsty than the feudal lords had been whom they hurried to the guillotine; and the despotism of the Bourbons was followed by the greater despotism of Napoleon. But is the lesson that which lies on the surface: "Better endure the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of?" Is it impossible to abolish the wrongs under which we suffer without substituting for them greater wrongs? It may be true that the tyranny of those accustomed to wealth and power is more endurable than the tyranny of lawlessness and anarchy would be. But is this the alternative? Is oppression a necessary element in human society? A thousand

times, no! The power and wealth of a great nation should not be allowed to come into the hands of the few in such manner that every millionaire produces a hundred thousand paupers. And when the trusts are dethroned the anarchists must not be elevated to their seats.

But we have houses of correction for the vicious, inebriate, and insane asylums for drunkards and those who lose their reason, hospitals for the sick and the victims of accidents, who would otherwise find no one to care for them. We have poor-boards and almshouses and out-door relief. In the large cities and in smaller places in times of special depression, there are cheap soup houses and lodging houses, and often a free distribution of food. And all these are established and supported by the well-to-do and wealthy people. They tax themselves that the unfortunate and even the vicious may be cared for, that the poor may not starve. They go further. They contribute of their means to maintain schools. They found and endow educational and benevolent institutions. We owe many of our colleges and theological seminaries to the munificence of the rich. Has not Pittsburgh's great coke and steel king given pipe organs to many churches and public libraries to a number of cities, even though it is a common remark in the mills that every act of this kind is followed by a cut in the wages of his workmen to reimburse himself? Some of our millionaires are magnificent in their charities as well as in their wealth.

Yes, but it is not gifts that self-respecting men want from their oppressors. *Panes et Circes*, was the cry of the Roman population only in its degenerate days. The legitimate object of private and public charity is to relieve the distress of the vicious and the unfortunate poor. The man that is strong of limb and sound in mind and sober and industrious of habit does not want charity from the rich. He wants justice, an opportunity to succeed by his own exertions, fair play, an even chance with all others in the race of life. He does not have that now.

Government is for the punishment of evil-doers and for the protection of those who do well. Laws must be made and

administered so as to give the rich no advantage over the poor. That will be a long step in the right direction. Monopoly and privilege as now existing must be abolished. They are a rehabilitation of feudalism and belong to the dark ages. No shadow of them must be left. There is no primogeniture in this country and the entailment of estates is not recognized by our laws. The laws should go farther, and prohibit it. Would that not be tyranny? No, it would only be legitimate protection for the many against the greed of the few. It would be prevention of tyranny. It might be well if all inheritance were abolished except that of an honored name, high character and personal culture. The principle is already recognized in the collateral inheritance tax which the state exacts from the estates of those who die without direct heirs. And the Pennsylvania Legislature has recently passed a direct inheritance tax law. The large fortunes of the wealthy should be heavily assessed for the public good, even if new interpreters of the constitution must be secured to bring it about, and after death their property might be used for the construction of good roads, the support of the public schools and the improvement of rivers and harbors. Their sons would have the same, if not superior opportunities of success in life which the sons of other men have.

The world has not been without attempts to solve the question under discussion. The early Christians had all things in common. This, however, proceeded from a religious rather than from an economic impulse. And we have no means of knowing how long the experiment continued. A more permanent attempt, and one based on economic, as well as religious grounds is recorded in the early history of the Israelites. They were a nation of agriculturists. The law was that every fiftieth year the landed estates should return to the original owners or their heirs. "In a kingdom whose foundation is the true religion," says Ewald, "the only things which can go wrong in the course of time and be set right again by human agency at particular periods, are the mutual relations in regard to the possession of the external goods of life. * * * The relations and conditions

of a nation's external possessions may go wrong to such an extent that gradually a few citizens become excessively rich, while the majority become excessively poor, so that irregularities arise which lead to the weakness or even the overthrow of the realm as a human institution. Human authority in ordinary times is tolerably competent to meet such threatening dangers, when the proper means for the purpose have a legal existence, and a legislator can not easily have a more worthy task than to devise the proper means by which such irregularities, which imperceptibly arise in the kingdom and which are such strong incitements to seeking redress by violence and revolution, may be legally counteracted, and an outbreak of brutal rebellion be avoided." It is the opinion of this distinguished student of the history of Israel that these regulations were in force for a number of centuries. (*Ant. of Israel*, pp. 272, 273.) A condition of things felt to be unjust confronted the Jewish lawgivers 3,500 years ago. They met and solved the difficulty. It exists among us to-day, only intensified an hundredfold.

The nineteenth century has witnessed a complete revolution in the production and distribution of the necessities, comforts and luxuries of life. The invention of machinery and its superiority to human strength, the large factory and its advantages over the small shops, telegraphic communication, rapid transit, the increase of capital, the concentration of population in large cities, the multiplication of artificial wants, making men much more dependent on one another than formerly, these things have put power and wealth into the hands of the few, and brought consequent industrial dependence to the many as in no preceding age of the world's history, and have greatly increased the difficulty of finding and applying a remedy. But "when the tale of brick is doubled then comes Moses." The age and country which produces the skill and genius to inflict a tremendous wrong upon the people, ought to be able to produce the wisdom and the statesmanship to correct that wrong. The nation that rid itself of the incubus of African slavery, which has outlawed Mormon polygamy, and which has often firmly resolved that free govern-

ment of the people, by the people, and for the people, should not perish from the earth, will certainly be able to provide a remedy against the unequal distribution of wealth among its citizens.

It is for the people to awake to the enormity of the evil under which a large portion of our population are suffering. The press, the platform and the pulpit must throw off their indifference and get rid of their own subserviency to wealth and power. The public conscience must be awakened. The patriot must be made to feel that the country is in danger, the Christian, that the principles of his religion are set at naught, the philanthropist that millions of innocent victims are being mercilessly tortured, the fathers and mothers that their children are being sold into an industrial slavery.

When once men in moderate conditions of comfort and prosperity, men of intellectual and moral culture, whom high character makes influential, begin to think of these things, the fire of their indignation will burn. The love of righteousness will assert itself. A new crusade will be preached, not against rich men or corporations and trusts as such, but against the greed and conscienceless exactions of certain rich men and their soulless syndicates. The matter must not be left in the hands of those who condemn all law and order, who do not believe in a future and in a God. We do not want another French Revolution. The struggle may be a long one, far longer than the anti-slavery struggle. But it will be between right and wrong, between the people and their oppressors. It is not hard to see who will win. A brutal, bloody, destructive upheaval of society is unnecessary. But a wise, statesmanlike and conservative readjustment is absolutely essential. We need not be wrought up to madness to do this. Our soberest senses are required to bring it about.

VIII.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

JONAH AND THE CRITICS.

Much excitement was occasioned some time ago by certain statements made by liberal theologians and preachers, calling in question the historicalness of the book of Jonah. The character of this book has long been a matter of dispute. The fact that it is counted among the prophetic writings shows that it was not regarded as ordinary history by those who arranged the Old Testament books. It was not written by the prophet Jonah. He is merely its hero, not its author. The aim of the book is didactic and edificatory. It was not written for the purpose of recording certain historical events, as though there were a saving power connected with them, but for the purpose of communicating certain moral and spiritual instruction. For this purpose, it is claimed by critical scholars, the book would be quite as effective, if the events recorded were regarded merely as imaginary and fictitious, as it can be if these events are regarded as real and actual. Fictitious narratives may be made the means for the communication of moral lessons, as we learn from our Lord's parables and from Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. Much of the world's most influential literature, both religious and secular, has taken the form of fiction; and to regard the book of Jonah in this character is at least not to do violence to any literary idea.

The announcement of this view, however, has recently been met by a perfect storm of opposition and reproach. An excited host of preachers and newspaper writers have sounded an anxious alarm. They see in this view nothing but peril to religion. If this view be correct, then, it is said, we have a denial of the supernatural in history and revelation. The reality of Jonah's miraculous fish must be assumed as a necessary support to the doctrine of supernaturalism. Even so sane a man as Mr. Moody

has been credited with saying that, if the story of Jonah goes, then the divinity of Christ goes, and with it goes every Christian doctrine, and in fact the whole system of Christianity. Not that such a story is inherently necessary to the essence of divine revelation. Ineed, if it were not in the Bible, the credibility of the Bible would be somewhat easier to maintain than it is now; but being in it, the story must be maintained at all costs as literal history; for if this may be denied, where is such denial to stop? Besides, the veracity of Jesus is supposed to be pledged to the historicalness of the story of Jonah. Jesus, it is said, refers to this story of Jonah's being three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, as a type of His being three days and three nights in the heart of the earth after His death. Thus, it is contended, Jesus has set the seal of His omniscience to the historicalness of the story of the miraculous fish; and to question this story must, therefore, be to deny the divinity of Christ, and to overthrow the foundations of Christianity. The critics among the theologians who do this must, accordingly, be enemies of the Bible, opponents of Christianity, and despisers of God.

Of this extreme view the *Christian Intelligencer*, of New York, whose orthodoxy will certainly not be questioned, has said: "This is dangerous ground and altogether unwarranted. What may be entirely logical and seemingly a necessary conclusion to one mind may to another, coming to the question from another standpoint, be far from conclusive." With that opinion we entirely agree. To stake the reality and divinity of Christianity upon the interpretation of a doubtful passage of Scripture, is certainly a most unwarranted and most rash proceeding. If such proceeding be followed honestly, then it is evidence of an alarmingly small degree of faith on the part of those concerned. The man whose faith hangs upon any such premise as this, is not a very strong believer in Christianity. A faith that would give way if the story of Jonah in the belly of the fish, or the story of Joshua making the sun to stand still, should prove not to be literal history, is certainly a most insecure kind of faith, and will most likely collapse, sooner or later. In fact no faith that can

be shaken by any merely external testimony or argument, can be secure Christian faith. The only secure Christian faith is that which possesses Christ directly, and is therefore in itself sure of its possession, needing no extraneous support to make it more sure. The preacher whose faith is in danger of snapping, if an argument in the chain of evidence gives way, is not going to accomplish much in the matter of converting the world to Christ. His need is to pray: "Lord, increase my faith." And if such doubts as these about the historicalness of the narrative of Jonah should have the effect of either driving such men out of the Christian ministry, or of driving them nearer to Christ, in either case they would have served a good purpose.

But, besides being an exposure of a lamentable degree of weakness of faith, this representation of the conclusions of the critical students of the Bible as anti-supernatural and anti-Christian, is unjust to these students of the Bible and perilous to the faith of unlearned Christians. In the first place this representation is unfair and unjust to a most earnest and able class of Bible students. To represent the critical theologians of the day, the men who have spent their talents and their lives in the enthusiastic and painstaking study of the Sacred Scriptures, as atheists, disbelievers in the supernatural and enemies of the Bible, is an offense against truth which no Christian ought ever to commit. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," is a command which those ought to bear especially in mind, who have a zeal for the honor of Scripture. These men, the critics, who study the Bible so minutely, are not enemies of the Bible. Their aim is not to destroy the Bible or to undermine confidence in it, but to find out what the Bible really is and what it teaches. There can be nothing gained by resisting or suppressing the truth. If there is any fiction in the Bible, or if there are in it errors in history, geography or science, they are the best friends of the Bible who honestly and fearlessly admit the fact. "Lying for God" is the most odious of all forms of falsehood.

Nor are the critics opponents of Christ. That there have

been unchristian critics must, of course, be admitted, but there have also been unchristian dogmatists, and the principles and methods of criticism are not responsible for any unbelief in the ranks of the critical scholars. The critical scholars, as a class, do not deny that the Son of God has come in the flesh. In their view, at least, the divinity of Christ does not stand or fall with any interpretation of the book of Jonah. But what about Jesus' reference to the miracle of the fish? Must not the historical character of that miracle be maintained in order to defend the veracity and divinity of Christ? The critics think not. In the first place, they point out the fact that our Lord's language in the parallel passage of St. Luke (xi. 29 sq.) is quite different from what it is in St. Matthew (xii. 39 sq.). In Luke there is nothing said about the miracle of the fish. The scribes and Pharisees had asked for a sign from heaven. Jesus answered: "This is an evil generation, it seeketh after a sign and there shall no sign be given unto it but the sign of Jonah. For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation." In what capacity was Jonah a sign? Plainly in the capacity of a prophet preaching repentance. This is evident from the concluding sentence of the passage: "For they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold a greater than Jonah is here." In Matthew we have the same course of thought, but this is *interrupted* by the statement concerning the three days and three nights in the belly of the fish. Let any one carefully read first the passage in Luke and then the one in Matthew and he will observe that this statement concerning the fish *breaks the connection of thought*. The inference, therefore, is obvious that the statement is not an utterance of Christ, but an interpolation; although it must be admitted that there is no manuscript evidence to this effect.

But in the second place, the critics contend that, even supposing the language in Matthew to be genuine, there is no valid reason for concluding that by quoting the story of the fish, Christ must necessarily have vouched for its historicalness. Do we not continually quote fictitious literature in the same way, without

supposing that any one will understand us to take it for literal truth? How often do we quote from the speeches of Homer's and Shakespeare's heroes, and how often do we refer to their history for purposes of illustration or argument, without in the least intending to imply that we take that history for literal fact? What reason, then, is there for supposing that our Lord must necessarily have assumed the literal historicalness of all the statements of the Old Testament to which He refers in His discourses, and that His divinity is pledged to the accuracy of this assumption? Jesus did not claim to be omniscient during His life in the flesh; and He doubtless used language and arguments much as other men do. When, for instance, He spoke of the rising and setting of the sun, He did not thereby communicate any divine authority to a particular system of astronomy. What reason, then, have we for supposing that by His quotations from the Old Testament He communicated any divine authority to a particular method of interpreting Scripture? This is the way in which the critics argue. In their view the credit of Jesus is not affected by such a question as whether the book of Jonah is history, or romance with a religious tendency. The critics, of course, may be wrong; but they are at least not enemies of Christ and of the Bible. Their purpose is not to destroy faith in the Bible, but to make faith more easy and the Bible more precious as a means of moral and spiritual teaching. Professor Cornill, of Königsberg, is one of those critics who deny the historicalness of the story of Jonah, but the following is what he says of the book of Jonah: "I have read the book of Jonah at least a hundred times, and I will publicly avow it, for I am not ashamed of my weakness, that I cannot even now take up this marvellous book, nay, or even speak of it, without the tears rising to my eyes, and my heart beating higher. This apparently trivial book, is one of the deepest and grandest that was ever written, and I should like to say to every one who approaches it, 'Take off thy shoes, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.'" (*Prophets of Israel*, p. 170.)

But, secondly, this intemperate and indiscriminate denuncia-

tion of the critical students of the Bible, in the pulpit and in the religious newspaper, is not only unjust to a most earnest class of theologians, but must also have an unfavorable effect upon the minds of common Christian believers. If common Christians are continually told that the most competent scholars of the Bible are not believers in the supernatural, will they not at last come to think that not to believe in the supernatural must be about the most natural state of mind? And here it might be pertinent to ask the question: what is the supernatural, anyway? How much argument and angry denunciation we have had on this subject during the past few months without any definition at all! There is more than one doctrine of supernaturalism. There is a rationalistic supernaturalism, which banishes God outside of His world, and supposes Him to interfere in its affairs only occasionally and in an external way—a supernaturalism which in fact is essentially at one with the deistic naturalism to which it seems to be opposed. According to this view the supernatural is not the divine being and power abidingly present in the world, but merely a series of disconnected interventions from a foreign realm. The Bible is the final result of these interventions, and since it has been written it is the only guide given to mortals to conduct them well through the journey of life. God Himself has withdrawn from the world. The Holy Spirit left the earth after He had accomplished the inspiration of the Bible. The Bible is divine, but the Church is not. With this view of the supernatural it is quite natural that there should be much nervous perturbation at the mere suggestion of the possibility of the Bible containing any errors. If there is one error in the Bible, or one fictitious narrative, then the Bible is no longer an infallible revelation, for *falsus in uno falsus in omnibus*. Hence these nervous fears inspired by the discoveries of the critics. Of course these fears are not shared by those who believe that Christ, according to His promise, is always with His Church through the spirit to guide her into all truth. And they are not less believers in the supernatural, but more; only their supernaturalism is of a different sort from that rationalistic-deistic

supernaturalism which was once so common in the Christian world. On this sort of supernaturalism the reader may consult with profit the *Life and Work of Dr. J. W. Nevin*, by Dr. Theodore Appel, pp. 714-15. Dr. Nevin asserts that this kind of spurious supernaturalism was the reigning orthodoxy in this country during the first part of the present century, and there is no doubt that its leading ideas are still lingering in many quarters.

It is to be feared, indeed, that the supernaturalism of many who are loudest in their talk about a supernatural Bible, is only of this bad sort; and when they are belaboring the critics, they are in fact only exposing the weakness of their own faith. But, as already intimated, their belaboring the critics can have no good effect for the further reason that the ability and learning are generally understood to be largely with the critics. Do not the people know that these much denounced men, like Professors Briggs, Cheyne, Driver, Cornill, and others, must know a great deal more about the Bible than the ordinary preacher and newspaper writer can know about it? Is it, then, good policy to keep up this denunciation? Will it not tend to shake the faith of some, to keep on telling them, from the pulpit and through the press, that the foremost Bible students of the age are not believers in Christianity and the Bible? If this were the truth, it would of course have to be told at all hazards. But, as we have already seen, the charge is not true. The men who believe that the book of Jonah is a romance, are not for that reason infidels; and it can do no good but only harm to disturb the minds of simple Christians by telling them the contrary. In any case the pulpit is not designed for the discussion of such themes. The book of Jonah can be used as a means of moral and spiritual instruction—instruction, for instance, concerning the omnipresence of God's power, the impartiality of his justice, and the universality of His love, without raising the question of its historical character; and these are the subjects for the discussion of which the pulpit exists. And we doubt very much whether the religious newspaper is well employed when it is used for the purpose of

creating suspicion or alarm in the popular mind as to the tendency of the teachers of theology. We believe that there is better and more profitable employment for the religious press than that.

PREACHING CHRIST.

The purpose of the preacher's office is to instruct and edify the Church. But the edification of the Church is possible only as the result of a continuous interaction and correspondence between it and its living Lord. Christ is the light and life of men. He is the source of moral and spiritual power for men; and without Him, or apart from Him, men can do nothing that is good. Hence the preacher can discharge his office only by serving as a medium of communication between Christ and the Church. What he preaches is Christ. "We preach Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God," says St. Paul, I. Cor. 1: 24.

But what is it to preach Christ? Upon the right answer to this question will depend, in a large measure, the effect of the preacher's activity. Christ has not lost His power; and if the preaching of the Gospel no longer produces its customary effects, it must be because Christ is not truly preached. We do not forget, of course, that the effect of the Gospel depends not merely upon the nature of its contents, nor upon the manner of the preacher, but also upon the character and disposition of the hearers. The word must be mixed with faith in them that hear, in order that it may produce its proper effect (Heb. 4: 2); and all men have not faith (II. Thess. 3: 2). There are some sons of perdition, who make the word of God unfruitful by their own unbelief. But it would nevertheless be a mistake for a preacher who sees his audience dwindling down to small proportions, to lay to his soul the flattering unction that his want of success has its cause not in any defect in his preaching, but solely in the spirit of reprobation among his hearers. Human nature now is the same as ever; and the preaching of the Gospel of Christ in its genuine power, will still have its old effect of drawing men unto Him and making them new creatures.

But in order to this effect, the preaching of the Gospel must be truly a preaching of Christ. Preaching merely *about* Christ, for instance, will not produce the effect for which the office of the preacher exists. There is doubtless much preaching in Christian pulpits that is not preaching Christ. Eulogies of Christ, for example, statements of doctrine about Christ and learned discourses upon His words and works, may all be presented in such form as shall make them to be devoid of the personal Christ Himself. And this may be the case not merely in heterodox pulpits, where the divinity of Christ is formally denied. Even in the most orthodox pulpits the preaching of the Gospel may cease to be a preaching of Christ and may degenerate into mere abstract statements of dogmas concerning Christ's person or work, which will kindle no faith and move to the performance of no duty. What is sometimes called objective preaching, that is, preaching which is supposed to deal with truth as something extrinsic to the mind and apart from experience, may be such a dead and fruitless performance. Thus ringing changes upon the name of Christ is quite possible without really preaching Christ; and theorizing about Christ, even if it be in the most orthodox way, may easily become a performance that has not Christ in it. The preacher may spin out profound theories concerning the incarnation of God, or concerning the atonement and similar interesting topics in scientific divinity, and yet touch no soul and produce no spiritual effect. Such performances are merely like the holding up of a dry light, in which there is neither warmth nor vitality and by which no soul can be quickened into a higher life. The most skillful theory of the atonement will not free a soul from sin, nor will the most ingenious theory of justification by faith ever justify a sinner.

The preaching of Christ consists not in presenting theories or doctrines about Christ, and about divine things, but in presenting Christ Himself in all the fullness of his living personality. The preacher's business is to *present* Christ, that is, to cause Him to be present to the souls of his hearers. And the presence of which we are here speaking is not merely an *ideal*, but a *real* or

personal presence. There is such a thing as an ideal presentation of an object, in virtue of which a lively imagination may summon around itself the great and good men of all past ages. One may fancy himself to be in the presence of Plato or Socrates and to hear from them words of philosophic and moral wisdom. And there is in such ideal communion something of an elevating, meliorating power. To call to memory, for instance, the counsels of wisdom and piety of a revered teacher or of an honored parent, will exercise something of a moralizing and saving influence. To reflect upon the example, the life and the teaching of a good man will have a tendency to make one good. And now such an ideal presence and communion is possible also in the case of our Lord Jesus Christ. We may with reverence and affection think of Christ as He was here nineteen centuries ago. We may follow Him with wonder as He performs His miracles, we may listen with rapt attention as He teaches the multitudes, and we may gaze upon Him with sympathy as He hangs upon the cross. In thought, in imagination we may cause Him to be present with us. And in such ideal presence there is something of redeeming power. Some, indeed, would have it that this is the only kind of presence that Christ can have for us. Christ Himself is dead and gone, like any other man. It is true He arose from the dead; but that was only to ascend into heaven, and thus to be the more effectually separated from us. And all that the preacher can do now is only to call up images of Christ by the skillful use of New Testament material; and these images are to be for the healing of the nations. *To this view we can not agree.* While we admit the possibility of an ideal presentation of Christ to the soul of the Christian, we demand vastly more than this in order to our salvation; and we hold that it is the Christian preacher's business to accomplish vastly more.

It is the Christian preacher's business to cause the living Christ Himself to be present, and to come into touch with the souls of his hearers. Christ is alive, and not dead; and the only effective way of preaching the Gospel, is to preach a living and not a dead Christ. There is a way of construing Christianity in

which this truth is ignored. Briefly, it runs about as follows: Christ has redeemed us by His death, by which He paid the penalty of our sins. The record of this redemption we have in the Bible by infallible inspiration. And all that we need to do now in order to be saved, is that we consent to this arrangement. We are justified by believing that our debt was paid by the death of Christ. Of a living and present Christ we have no need. All that we need is the dead Christ. This Gospel of a dead Christ has been preached all too long; and the consequence is largely a dead Church. What the Church at the present time needs to quicken it into new life is the sense of a living and present Christ—not merely a Christ occasionally manufactured on the altar by priestly magic, but a Christ who, in His living and omnipresent personality, is at no time absent from us. And the preacher who rightly understands his office will exercise his functions in the consciousness that he is serving as the medium through which the minds of his hearers are brought into touch with the mind of the living Christ.

This may, in the first place, be explained to mean a presentation, through the preacher, of the character and mind of the living Christ to the Church for its instruction and edification. The character of Christ must ever be regarded as the ideal or pattern of a Christian life. And this pattern it is the business of the preacher ever to set before the eyes of his congregation as an ideal, by the contemplation of which they are to be transformed into the same image, from glory unto glory. But whence is the preacher himself to obtain this pattern? From the picture, it may be answered, which he finds of it in the New Testament. That answer is, of course, true; but it is after all only partially true. The picture of the historical Christ is a local, a finite picture. It presents us the Christ in definite historical surroundings and circumstances. But the eternal Christ who is the pattern for every man, is more than that. In the picture of the New Testament, for instance, Christ is not a husband and father; and yet Christ is to be presented as an example to husbands and fathers. In the picture He does not appear as a ruler, or mer-

chant, or business man; and yet He is to be an example to rulers and merchants, and men of business. In the picture He belongs to a certain age and nation; but He is to be an example to all times and peoples. How, then, is the preacher to discover that character of Christ which may be held up as a living ideal to men in all times and circumstances? We answer, by knowing Him not merely according to the flesh, but by learning to know Him according to the Spirit—by holding communion with the living and glorified Christ until he has entirely caught His mind and received the impression of His character. "We have the mind of Christ," says St. Paul; and any preacher who can not appropriate that sentence to himself, can not be a true preacher of Christ.

But to have the mind of Christ means more than to have thoroughly studied Christ's utterances in the New Testament. It implies that, of course, but it implies also an immediate personal communion with the living Christ. And in this communion there must be conceived an activity in the divine object no less than in the human subject. Christ must be able now to impress His mind upon His servants no less really than Jehovah impressed His mind in old times upon His servants, the prophets, and this without any contravention of the laws of psychology, which govern the acquisition of all knowledge. Shall the possibility of making such impressions now be denied to Christ? Then the Church is hopelessly separated from her head, and in that case His divinity could be no profit to her. We have had eager disputes in recent times concerning the question of Christ's omniscience during the days of His flesh. Did He then know infallibly, for instance, the authorship of the pentateuch, or of the 110th Psalm, and similar things? Some, going beyond any claims that Christ Himself ever made, have given an affirmative answer to this question. But what is that question in comparison with the question whether *now* He knows all things, and is able also to communicate His mind to His servants in the Church, concerning those things which it is necessary, or profitable, for them to know? *This we affirm.* And we hold that it is just this that

makes the Christian ministry a ministry of Christ—an organ through which Christ impresses upon the Church His own mind for its instruction, direction and spiritual edification. And the more fully conscious the Christian ministry may at any time be of this great fact, the more efficiently will it discharge its functions. Some may call this mysticism, or at least transcendentalism. It is, however, nothing more than the mysticism of St. Paul, who felt sure that in himself Christ was speaking to the Corinthians (II. Cor. xiii. 3), or the mysticism of Jesus, who assured His disciples that the Spirit of their Father should speak in them, and who on the eve of His departure promised to send the Holy Spirit to abide with the disciples forever, to glorify Himself in them, and to lead them into all truth. Should anyone answer that this promise extended only to the age of the New Testament, we should reply that for such an one Christianity is virtually extinct, and arguing with him could accomplish no good.

To preach Christ, then, means to proclaim the mind and will of Christ to the men of any generation according to their circumstances and needs. It means to have apprehended that which is true and right according to the mind of Christ, and to proclaim truth and right to the world for its present spiritual illumination and guidance. In order to such an apprehension of the mind of Christ, no supernatural or miraculous revelation is needed. What is needed is that the human mind simply withdraw into its own depths and there, undisturbed by the world's voices, but touched by the universal mind of God, listen to what the voice of the Spirit may say. The Spirit has at all times something to say to the churches, if men have but ears to hear. And, in fact, all truth is in a profound sense divine truth and can only come to the human mind through communion with the divine Reason, or Logos, which is in Christ. Truth in its ultimate essence is the divine thinking, and we come into possession of the truth only by thinking in harmony with the divine mind. If it be true that the conscience is the voice of God in the human soul universally, then how much more must it be true that the moral understand-

ing which is in the Christian man is an inspiration of the Almighty giving the knowledge of His own mind and will. It is in this way that moral knowledge especially advances among men. It was thus, for instance, that Christ's servants, in quite modern times, came to understand the unlawfulness and the wrong of slavery, and they truly preached Christ when they insisted that it was the will of God that slavery should be destroyed. There was a time when slavery was defended on Biblical grounds. The Bible was supposed to favor it. Noah predicted the eternal bondage of Canaan. Abraham was a slave holder. Christ uttered no word of condemnation of the institution. Paul sent back the run-away slave Onesimus and exhorted Christian slaves patiently to remain in their present condition. Does it not follow from all this that slavery is a divine institution? So men once reasoned. But there came a time when such reasoning was no longer accepted. Now no one accepts it. All Christians are agreed that slavery is wrong. Whence, then, came the knowledge of its wrongfulness? From a better understanding of the Bible, it may be answered. But whence comes this better understanding of the Bible? Manifestly it cannot come from any activity of the Bible itself. It must, therefore, come from a new impression of the Spirit of the Lord, awakening new moral sentiments in the Christian mind. And so, now, new moral sentiments are being awakened on sociological and economic subjects.

Until quite recently it was supposed to be right for some men to get all they can of the goods of this world, while others are prevented from getting anything at all. Occasionally a voice may still be heard in the pulpit defending that "dismal doctrine." But the mind of the Church is changing. The truth is coming to make itself felt that all men are brothers, and that this idea of brotherhood must exercise its influence in the conduct of the world's business. And this change is doubtless due to a new manifestation of the mind of Christ. It is sometimes said that the advocates of social reform along lines of equal justice and of humanity, are not Christians, because they do not use the set phrases of traditional theology, and because they maintain

propositions contrary to those which were once maintained by the Church. But one may be a Christian, and even a Christian preacher, without ringing changes on the name of Christ. In fact, one who has the mind of Christ may be far more of a Christian than he who uses the name. One who insists on doing justly, and loving mercy, and walking humbly with God, is a better Israelite than he who insists on sacrifices and burnt offerings.

But, secondly, to preach Christ is to cause Him to be present to the souls of men in the moral power of His glorified personality. It is to bring the souls of those to whom one preaches into vital touch with the spirit of Christ. And in such touch with Christ there is the spring of new moral and spiritual life for men. It was so when He was here in the flesh, nineteen centuries ago. Then the men and women who came into contact with Him became new creatures. He was for them not merely a law, an example, a moral ideal, but a quickening inspiration, a moral dynamic. He said to men not merely, look at Me and see what you ought to be, but He said, look at Me and you shall become what I am. As power went out from Him to heal men's physical diseases, so also power went out from Him to renew, and quicken, and transform their moral nature. There was morally regenerating power in His touch and look. When Zacheus looked into His eyes and Jesus looked into his, then Zacheus became an honest man, which before that he had not power to be. So when Mary Magdalene looked upon Him, and He looked upon her, she became a pure and godly woman. This moral power was in His personality, and passed over from Him to others who came into touch with His spirit, and whose will presented no bar to its operation. Moral power can only reside in personality, not in abstract doctrines, formulas, or propositions. The power to love and the power to repent can only come from a loving and holy personality. And the moral life of God could be fully communicated to the world only through the person of His son.

And what Christ was in the days of His flesh, that He is still,

namely, the source of moral power for the world. And the Church is the sphere, and the ministry the organ for the exercise of that power. It is the office of the Christian preacher, accordingly, not merely to tell men of a Christ who was here nineteen centuries ago, and to point them to His life here as an example of right living, and to His death as a propitiatory sacrifice for sins, but it is the office of the preacher, further, to serve as a medium for bringing men's souls into touch with the spirit of Christ in order that they may be quickened into new spiritual life and growth. And this office he accomplishes alike in the preaching of the word and in the administration of the sacraments; but the basis for this accomplishment must be in his own moral and Christian personality. One who is not a Christian can, therefore, not be a true preacher of Christ. One whose own sins have not been forgiven, can not be the medium of forgiveness to others. It is only from the body of the believer that streams of living water can flow. The only Christ whom any preacher can bring to men for their salvation, is the Christ within himself. And yet this does not make Christ merely a subjective fancy. No man can preach Christ in any other character than that in which he has apprehended Him in his own heart; and yet the Christ thus preached will be infinitely more than the preacher's own experience. And when thus preached, out of the fulness of a Christian heart, and yet as the eternal and ever-living Son of God, then Christ will still draw all men, who hear the message, unto Himself, and transform them into His own image, from glory unto glory.

CLERICAL THOUGHT ON SOCIOLOGICAL QUESTIONS.

There is at the present time a great deal of thought devoted to sociological subjects by ministers of the Gospel, as well as by men of other professions. Large numbers of ministers are writing on these subjects; and their productions are finding their way into books and periodical publications, thus helping to swell the already enormous amount of literature now devoted to the science

of social well-being. Still larger numbers, it may be presumed, are at times preaching sermons on sociological and economic questions, thus helping to form public opinion on these questions. And others, no doubt, who are neither writing nor preaching on these questions, are more or less engaged in the study of them, and are influencing public opinion through private social intercourse with their fellow citizens.

This fact is significant in many respects. It indicates, in the first place, that the scope of the Christian religion and of the Christian ministry is apprehended in a wider sense than has generally been the case heretofore. Christianity is coming to be understood, not merely as an arrangement to get people into heaven when they die, but as a power to make them live righteously and well here and now. Godliness is profitable for the world which now is as well as for that which is to come. Christianity tells men not merely what they are to believe in regard to God, heaven, and a future life; but it tells them how they ought to live here, and affords them the power to do what it requires. Christianity is to its very core an ethical religion. And its ethical determinations have to do not merely with men as individuals, but also with men as members of society. It prescribes social as well as individual duties, and aims at the realization of social as well as individual well-being. The cultivation of sociological thought by the Christian ministry, therefore, is an evidence of a more comprehensive conception of the functions of the ministry than has generally prevailed heretofore. And it is an evidence also of closer agreement with the scientific thought of the time, which lays so much stress upon the influence of environment in the production of individual character and bliss.

But this widespread cultivation of sociological thought, among the ministry as well as among laymen, is an evidence also of a peculiar social condition. There is a pressure, a feeling of uneasiness, in the social world, such as has existed at but few periods in history. The social atmosphere of the age is heavy; and there is a general feeling of uncertainty and anxiety as to the things which are coming upon the earth. This is an age of

stupendous material development. The invention of machinery, the consolidation of industry and the exploitation of labor, have resulted in a portentous increase of wealth. But the distribution of this wealth is so unequal, that it has seriously disturbed the equilibrium of society; and this is the substance of the social problem in our time. On the one hand we have the millionaire, hard, cold, proud and self-satisfied; and on the other hand we have the proletariat, hungry, sullen, discontented and turbulent. The classes and the masses are ever growing farther apart, and viewing each other with increasing suspicion and distrust, if not with positive hatred. And no class of men have better opportunities for learning to understand the condition of the social world than the pastors of the churches have. They see its sufferings, realize its hardships and are familiar with the mutterings of the multitudes who find it ever more and more difficult to maintain their existence. And they see, too, that the "statesmen" and politicians are not doing anything to relieve the distress. These have no remedy. While they talk of the "majesty of the law," they are engaged in circumventing each other; that is all. In these circumstances it is no wonder that the attention of the ministers of religion is drawn to sociological studies. When the times are out of joint, and when the very foundations of society are trembling, it is fitting that not only men of letters and science, but also the teachers of religion should busy themselves with thoughts of the problems confronting the civilization of the age.

Much of the sociological thought with which the age is teeming is doubtless crude and ill-digested. This is especially the case when remedial measures come to be under consideration. It is easier to diagnose the disease than to prescribe the remedy. The plans proposed for curing the ills of society are often wild and fatuous, and, if put into operation, would rather aggravate than cure those ills; though in this respect, it should be said, ministers of the Gospel do not usually show less wisdom than is shown by men of other professions when talking and writing on the same subjects. The economists, legislators and politicians

have, to say the least, not as a rule shown themselves any wiser than the ministers of religion. The remedies proposed by preachers as well as by politicians, it can often be shown, would be no remedies at all. And this fact is sometimes made a cause of reproach to sociological thought in any form. What good, it is said, will it do to talk about the evils which afflict society, unless it is possible to suggest a remedy that will at once cure them? Will not this merely tend to cause men to feel their ills more keenly, and to make them the more impatient in bearing them, while there can be no possible hope of deliverance? Millionairism and pauperism may be symptoms of a diseased social organism. But what remedy is there for the disease? You can not despoil the rich man of his millions; and if you did despoil him and divide his possessions equally among the members of society, the next day there would be inequality again. The body politic may be afflicted with political corruption, with oppression and wrong; but "what are you going to do about it?" as Mr. Tweed once said of the corrupt ring rule of New York City, of which he himself was a most influential factor. But Mr. Tweed lived to find out what could be done about it; and some of us will live to find out what can be done about the social condition which now involves so much unfairness and suffering to large masses of men. To show that this condition is evil, is enough for the present. The remedy will come in due time. To have demonstrated that ring rule, monopoly tyranny, and trust power, and similar phenomena of the modern social world, are not necessarily inherent in the nature of society, and do not correspond with the divine idea of society, is a service which will in time lead to something more. When the wrongfulness of slavery was demonstrated, then the doom of that "divine institution" was sealed.

And it is this service which the intense sociological thought of the present moment is performing for society. That so large a part of the Christian ministry is interested in this sociological thought, is an indication, moreover, that the problems with which society is confronted are coming to be regarded as religious and

moral problems. They are not merely political and economic problems, disconnected entirely from all religious and ethical considerations. The contrary, indeed, may be implied in the phrase which is now somewhat popular, that "the affairs of government must be administered on business principles." If this means that ethical principles are to have no consideration in the conduct of organized society, then it is a vicious rule and should be condemned. Social questions are ethical questions, because society is an ethical organism. The question of taxation, for instance, which has so much to do with the welfare of society, the question of wages, and the question of the treatment of laborers in mills and mines, are not merely questions of dollars and cents. They are moral questions, and the time is coming when they will be so regarded. And the time is coming, too, when the man who is growing rich solely by the exploitation of other people's toil, will not be allowed comfortably to sit in a church with Christian people, or mingle in society with ethically cultured men and women. And when that result shall have been accomplished, then the social problem of our time will have been solved, and the weight which is now resting upon society will be lifted. And to contribute to this result is a performance worthy of the highest calling known among men.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE GOSPEL FOR AN AGE OF DOUBT; The Yale Lectures On Preaching, 1896. By Henry Van Dyke. The Macmillan Co., N. Y.

The Yale Lectures on Preaching occupy a prominent place on the shelves of many a minister's library. They are eminently entitled to such a place. Better or wiser counsel upon the numerous questions connected with the preaching of "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God" than is contained in the several courses of lectures given now for some successive years on the Lyman Beecher foundation at Yale University, is nowhere to be found. Many of the ablest and most successful divines of different denominations have brought their maturest thought, and richest experience to these lectures and given them for the instruction and helpfulness of their fellow laborers in the ministry of the Church. Pastors desiring to be abreast with the times can ill afford to be without a knowledge of the valuable advice, the vital inspiration, and the rich suggestiveness of these volumes.

This seems particularly true of the contribution to the series which Dr. Van Dyke has made under the title 'The Gospel for an Age of Doubt.' The author is too well and favorably known as preacher, writer and poet, to make it necessary to speak of the moral and spiritual uplift given by his pages; the fine artistic quality of his literary efforts, or the clear, penetrating and comprehensive insight he possesses for discerning the signs of the times on the one hand, and on the other for suggesting the correctives which present aspects of faith and thought and conduct stand in need of in order that life in our day may be brought more nearly to the standard of the Christian ideals.

In these lectures our author has followed in the wake of none of his distinguished predecessors, but has marked out a course bearing the stamp of his own genius. Aiming "to be of help to the circle of men and women who care for the vital problems of faith," he finds no room for what may be called subordinate if not trifling details of manner and form in preaching, details to which other lecturers have given not a little time and attention. It is his conviction that "the force of religion to move and inspire the hearts of men lies not in the forms and modes of preaching, but in the Gospel, the message which it brings to the human soul. The deep question, the question of widest interest is what to preach to the men and women of to-day to cheer them, to uplift them, to lead them back to faith and through faith to a brave, full, noble life."

The earnestness of this conviction, and the seriousness with which it moves him in attempting to point the way to an answer to this question, determine the color and character of every one of the eight lectures which go to make up the greater part of the book. The subject of these several lectures are as follows; *An Age of Doubt, The Gospel of a Person, The Unveiling of the Father, The Human Life of God, The Source of Authority, Liberty, Sovereignty, Service.* Appended to these chapters there are notes covering more than a hundred and twenty pages, and taken chiefly from recent publications. They are designed to confirm his own view of modern doubt and to show that many men of all classes are moving towards a renewal of their faith.

The first lecture, taking literature as an index of life, shows that ours is an age of earnest, restive, widespread doubt. Its doubt differs greatly, however, from the blatant, bitter and frivolous unbelief of last century. It is sober, sad, despairing, as is evidenced by the wider range of writers from whom he quotes. The expansion of knowledge, the arrogance of science falsely so-called, and the audacious assumptions of Naturalism and Agnosticism have contributed to this doubt. In Germany, France, England, and America hopeful signs are to be seen, however, that skepticism is thinking its way back from its melancholy and painful void to a position where it can confess, with the famous biologist Romanes, that "it is reasonable to be a Christian believer." "The preacher who wishes to speak to this age must read many books in order that he may be in a position to make the best use of what Sir Walter Scott called 'the one Book.'"

The second lecture, an admirable piece of vigorous and lucid writing, shows that the force of the Gospel resides in the person of Christ Jesus, who saves men from sin, and thus comes close to the heart of a doubting age. The third chapter, devoted to the consideration of the Deity of Christ, essays to answer the question wherein the Gospel of the Incarnation of the Son of God is adapted to the needs of this age. It declares the unveiling of the Father in Christ to be the Palladium of Christianity. The complementary truth thus insisted upon is advanced in the next chapter wherein the doctrine of the real manhood of Jesus is developed. It is a highly satisfactory answer to the cry of the human heart for a human Saviour, a Saviour who affords it "a vision of the human life of God." The fifth chapter on the source of religious authority is particularly strong and clear. One can't fail to understand what the author's position is. He knows no authority but that of the Divine-Human Saviour: "Christ is the light of all Scripture, Christ is the master of holy reason, Christ is the sole Lord of the true Church. By His word we test all doctrines, conclusions and commands, on His word we build all faith. This is the source of authority in the kingdom of heaven." Efficient preachers to this age of doubt must neither

forget nor hesitate to appeal always to this authority with untrembling certainty and positive conviction. Unless one can do so in preaching "one would better go out of business entirely."

The three remaining chapters on liberty, sovereignty and service are severally deserving of far more space than can here be given to all of them. Out of the authoritative teaching of Christ "three truths emerge and stand out clear and sharp as mountain peaks against the blue sky, the truth of human liberty, the truth of divine sovereignty, and the truth of universal service. To these three truths we must bear witness unhesitatingly, faithfully and joyfully if our preaching is to be a gospel for this age of doubt." In the discussion of these concluding problems Dr. Van Dyke shows the courage of his convictions. His thought is clearly in advance of many of his denominational brethren in the ministry. But the skill and sweetness with which he advances his arguments are calculated to win acceptance for them rather than to arouse opposition against them. Dr. Murray, Princeton University, several months ago wrote that if any person ever read George Eliot's *Silas Marner* without becoming the better for it, it would be difficult to say how such a person could be made better. If any preacher can read Dr. Van Dyke's *Gospel for an Age of Doubt*, without becoming a better preacher for it, it would be difficult to say how such a person could be made a better preacher!

A. S. W.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP: Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1897. Pages 338.

This work consists of ten lectures delivered in the Adams chapel of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, in the months of October, November and December of 1896, by representative divines, chosen from seven religious denominations. The subjects of the lectures in the order given in the book are as follows: I. "The Principles of Christian Worship;" by the Rev. Charles Cuthbert Hall, D.D., President of the Faculty of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. II. "Primitive Christian Liturgies;" by the Rev. A. V. G. Allen, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Protestant Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass. III. "The Greek Liturgies;" by the Rev. Egbert C. Smyth, D.D., Professor of Church History in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. IV. "The Roman Liturgies;" by the Rev. Charles C. Tiffany, D.D., Archdeacon of New York City. V. "The Lutheran Liturgies;" by Rev. Henry Eyster Jacobs, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa. VI. "The Liturgies of the Reformed Churches;" by the Rev. William Rupp, D.D., Professor of Practical Theology in the Reformed Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa. VII. "The Book of Common Prayer;" by the Rev. William R. Huntington, D.D., Rector of Grace Church, New York City. VIII. "The

Book of Common Order and the Directory for Worship;" by the Rev. Allen Pollock, D.D., principal of the Presbyterian College, Halifax, Nova Scotia. IX. "Worship in Non-Liturgical Churches;" by the Rev. George Dana Boardman, D.D., LL.D., Honorary Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa. X. "The Ideal of Christian Worship;" by the Rev. Thomas S. Hastings, D.D., LL.D., President of the Faculty of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The first lecture, as the title indicates, is introductory to the series that follows. The lecturer defines the term "worship" as applied to the service of the sanctuary. Then follows a treatment of the fundamental elements which enter into a well-ordered congregational service. These elements are the hymn, the Scripture, the belief, the prayer, the oblation, the teaching, and the sacraments. This prepares the way for the consideration of those "broad principles which constitute the real foundations of Christian worship." These are grouped into two classes. The one class consists of the subjective principles, the Will of God, and the intuition of Man, and upon these rests, fundamentally, the institution of Christian worship. The other class comprehends the objective principles underlying the institution. These are "the affirmative use" which "contemplates Christian worship as testimony, comprehending the evangelical facts and uttering the same continuously and effectively, as a propagandism of spiritual light and hope, throughout a world lying in the Evil One;" "the conservative use of Christian worship," by which faith is kept alive "amidst vanishing empires and dissolving philosophies;" amidst persecutions from without, and dissensions within the Church; and, finally, "the educative use of Christian worship" which "makes it a part of sociology."

The lectures that follow are, of course, of an historical and descriptive character. In the main, they all recognize the principles and elements set forth in the first. The reader cannot help being impressed with the unanimity of opinion as to the nature of true worship and the elements which should enter into it. Worship is a thing of growth, just as doctrine; it is rooted in the past and must draw its material from thence while it recognizes present needs and conditions, and adapts itself to them. Some thirty years ago when the Reformed Church in the United States was passing through what is usually called "the liturgical conflict," but which is now beginning to be regarded as a liturgical revival that laid the foundation for the active missionary operations since then in progress, she received little sympathy from some of her sister denominations. The prophecy, then spoken, that other denominations would be confronted with the same problem, in the future, is now going into fulfilment. The cry for change comes from two sides: "In recent years there has been a growing uneasiness with reference to this subject, both in liturgical and unliturgical

churches. The former want more liberty, at least some room for free prayer; the latter want less liberty and more uniformity." In striking confirmation of this deliverance of Dr. Hastings in the last lecture of the course, is the lecture of Dr. Boardman, who, though representing the unliturgical churches, is decidedly in sympathy with such liturgical usage as shall guard against "mere routine worship" on the one hand, and "possible disasters incident to extemporaneous prayers" on the other, while he would accord the people a large share in the devotional part of the service. In this he is at one with the representatives of most liturgical churches. There must be freedom, flexibility; times, seasons, occasions must be allowed to temper the spirit and form of the service.

It would be a pleasing task to present in detail those points of agreement between the views of those lecturers whose subjects permitted them to express an opinion, especially to call attention to the marked agreement between the lectures of Dr. Pollock and Dr. Hastings and our own Dr. Rupp, but mindful of the admonition to be brief, we can only add, that we prize this splendid little work most highly and express the wish that it may find a place in the library of every minister of our land. Especially is it to be commended to the younger ministers, as it contains a very full and reliable history of the development of Christian worship in its unity and variety, and will prove an efficient and safe guide to those who wish to make a further study of the subject.

A. J. H.

THE WHENCE AND THE WHITHER OF MAN; A Brief History of his Origin and Development through Conformity to Environment. Being the Morse Lectures of 1895, by John N. Tyler, Professor of Biology, Amherst College. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1896. Pages, 312. Price, \$1.75.

In this volume we have an account of the creation of man according to the theory of evolution. According to some the ideas of evolution and of creation are contradictory. If evolution be accepted as a true theory of the origin of the universe, then the doctrine of creation, it is thought, must be given up. Professor Tyler thinks differently. He maintains that the power and wisdom of the Creator are demanded equally, whether we suppose the world to have been made by an act of immediate creation or by a process of evolution. According to the first theory the creative power has been concentrated in one primal act, according to the second it has been distributed over a series of acts. But in either case it is God that is the author of the universe. Evolution is not a power, but a process; and the power which is back of the process is the will of God. In this sense Professor Tyler is an evolutionist, and traces in a very interesting manner the evolution of the civilized man of the nineteenth century from the primitive protoplasm through the various organic forms of the animal world.

It will be said perhaps that this is not consistent evolutionism; for Huxley and Tyndall, and Spencer are evolutionists, and they dispense with the idea of God in their construction of the theory of the universe. Evolutionism, therefore, must necessarily be atheistic. To such an assumption it would be enough to say that the great majority of evolutionists are Christian believers; and, it may be added, all scientific thinkers almost without exception are evolutionists. Some of the greatest mathematical astronomers, like Laplace, were atheists too, but that does not prove that all mathematical astronomers must be atheists. Many an astronomer has proved that astronomy is not anti-Christian; and so Professor Tyler proves in this volume that evolution is not in itself anti-Christian.

There are different theories of evolution, and in all theories there are some open questions. According to some, natural selection is the one great power which has brought about the present variety of animated existence; while according to others, it is an initial tendency to progression in the primitive idioplasm that accounts for the diversity of living forms. Then there is the difference between the followers of Darwin, or, as Professor Tyler calls them, the Neo-Lamarckians, who hold that properties acquired during the life-time of individuals may be transmitted to their offspring, and the followers of Weismann who maintain the opposite. On these various questions the author sums up his own views in the following paragraphs:

"Each theory contains important truth. Nägeli's view of the importance of initial tendencies, inherent in the original living substance, is too often undervalued. My own conviction, at least, is steadily strengthening that, without some such original tendency or aim, evolution would never have reached its present culmination in man. His error lies in emphasizing this factor too exclusively. The fundamental proposition of Weismann's theory, that heredity is due to germ-plasm, seems to contain important truth. But we need not, therefore, accept his theory of a germ-plasm so isolated and independent as to be beyond control or influence by the habits of the body. The importance of use and disuse, and the transmissibility of their effects, would seem to supply a factor essential to evolution. Weismann has done good service in emphasizing the stability of the germ-plasm. Evolution is always slow, and, for that very reason, sure."

"If these conclusions are correct, they have an important practical bearing. Struggle and effort are essential to progress. Not inborn talent alone, but the use which one makes of it, counts in evolution. The effects of use and disuse are cumulative. The hard fought battle of past generations becomes an easy victory in the present, just because of the strength acquired and handed down from the past struggle. Persistent variation toward evil is in time weeded out by natural selection. And, while evil remains

in the world, we are to lay up stores of strength for ourselves and our descendants by sturdily fighting it. But the effects of right living through a hundred generations are not overcome by the criminal life of one or two. Evil surroundings weigh more in producing criminals than heredity, and their children are not irreclaimable," pp. 307-8.

From the last sentence it will be seen that the author lays great stress upon environment. Indeed this idea is expressed on his very title page. It is man's origin and development through *conformity to environment* that is to be described. But in environment there is something more than material existence. There is in it a personal power—a power that is intelligent and moral—a power that works for righteousness; and this makes man a personal, an intelligent and moral being. In Christianity this personal environment comes still nearer to man, and man comes to be touched and impressed by the very life of God. What is Christianity? The author answers, pp. 253-4, "not merely intellectual belief in a creed," "not mere feeling or emotion," but "the true divine idea of it is a *life*." This is what men need, and this is what we are to realize especially in our time. And this is what the world has in Jesus Christ. Christ is a divine fountain of moral life for men, and this comes to them through their environment. Hence Professor Tyler says, with great force, p. 252, "Preach Christ and Him crucified, not merely dead two thousand years ago, but risen and alive for evermore, and with us to the end of the world, the grandest, most heroic, divinest helper who ever stood by a man, one all-powerful to help, and who never forsakes, and every one of your hearers who is not dead to truth will catch the life, and go home and live not alone. *So long as we preach a dead Christ we shall have a dead church, as hopeless as the apostles were before the resurrection.*"

It is thus that an evolutionist can instruct preachers, and tell how they must present the Gospel, if their message is to have its proper effect. Not Christ, a dead sacrifice, but Christ, a living Saviour, is the power of the Gospel that will quicken men into spiritual life. "Our Lord and Master is the connecting link between God and man, through whom God's own Holy Spirit is poured like a mighty flood into the hearts and lives of men, transfiguring them and filling them with the divine power," p. 252. It is thus that an evolutionist can speak. And is not that better theology than much of what comes from quarters in which sermons are preached periodically with a view of annihilating evolution? We heartily commend this book to our readers, who want to know more about the whence and the whither of man.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE HEXATEUCH; By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. New Edition, revised and enlarged. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, Publishers. 1897. Pages, 288. Price, \$1.75.

This work was first published in 1892. In the present edition it has undergone a thorough revision, and has also received numerous additions both in the body of the book and in new appendices. The main body of the work is intended for theological readers generally, and is comparatively free from technical details. In the appendices, however, such details are given for the benefit of Hebrew students, who will find in this volume all that is necessary in order to a thorough comprehension of the present state of criticism of the first six books of the Bible, in the treatment of which the higher criticism has produced its most important results.

As an accurate and accomplished Hebrew scholar Professor Briggs has no superior in this country. He has studied his subject with utmost care and thoroughness, and the conclusions which he reaches are always based upon the best of reasons. It should be observed, however, that in these conclusions he does not stand alone, but is in agreement with the great majority of Old Testament critics both in Europe and America. There is a marked degree of unanimity among the critics, which must go far to convince the ordinary scholar that their conclusions are not groundless assumptions. That the Hexateuch is a composite work consisting of a number of originally independent documents, which were written at different times, and combined into a single work by an editor, or editors, is a proposition which all critics would accept. The great majority would also accept the view that the documents combined in the Hexateuch were at least four, which are usually designated by the letters E, J, D and P; and they would in general agree as to the limits of the documents. As to the time when the documents were composed there would be some difference of opinion, but the majority would adopt the order of succession just indicated.

In the work before us we have a detailed narrative of the history of the Higher Criticism, and an account of the difficulties of the traditional view, which have called this criticism into existence. Any one who has once come to appreciate the difficulties involved in the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, can no longer be satisfied to accept that view in an unmodified form. When, for instance, we read in Gen. 12: 6 that Abraham pursued the oriental Kings "as far as Dan," and in Jud. 18: 29 that the city of Dan did not receive that name until long after the time of Moses, it becomes difficult to believe in the Mosaic authorship of Genesis; and this difficulty is increased by each one of the numerous instances of the same kind which occur throughout the Pentateuch. The efforts of commentators,

holding the traditional view, to explain these discrepancies, are generally not satisfactory, and are mutually contradictory. It is sometimes said that the views of the higher critics refute each other; there is, however, as Professor Briggs shows in this volume, far more agreement among the critics than there is among the traditionalists when they undertake to solve the difficulties with which the critics deal.

Some of the critics who support the documentary and developmental theory of the Pentateuch, have but little confidence in its historical character. Among these are, for example, Reuss, Wellhausen, and Kuenen. They are willing to take the Old Testament for history so far as its purely natural elements are concerned, but they are suspicious of the miraculous elements, and will not admit the Bible to be a revelation from God in any sense different from that in which any sacred literature may be said to be such. To this class of critics Professor Briggs does not belong, as the following quotation from the work under notice will prove: "The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch vindicates its credibility. It strengthens the historical credibility (1) by showing that we have four parallel narratives instead of the single narrative of the traditional theory; and (2) by tracing these narratives to their sources in the more ancient documents buried in them. It traces the development of the original Mosaic legislation in its successive stages of codification in accordance with the historical development of the kingdom of God. It finds minor discrepancies and inaccuracies such as are familiar to students of the Gospels; but these increase the historic credibility of the writings as they show that the writers and compilers were true to their sources of information even when they could not harmonize them in all respects," p. 3.

Professor Briggs gives expression to his idea of the value of the Higher Criticism in the following paragraph: "The deeper study of the unity and variety of the Hexateuchal narratives and laws, as we defend their historicity against Reuss, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, and advance in the apprehension of their sublime harmony, will fructify and enrich the theology of our day, just as deeper study of the unity and variety of the Gospels by the school of Neander, in the defence of them against Straus, Renan, and Baur, has been an unspeakable blessing in the past generation. This having been accomplished, we may look forward to a time when our eyes shall be opened as never before to the magnificent unity of the whole Bible in the midst of its wondrous variety. Then the word of God, as one supernatural divine revelation, will rise into such a position of spiritual power and transcendent influence as shall greatly advance the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and hasten the realization of that most blessed hope of both the Old and New Testament, the coming of the Messiah in glory," p. 162.

That, we think, proves at least that all Higher Criticism is not hostile to the idea of the supernatural. Professor Briggs is not excelled by any one in the thoroughness with which he applies the critical method to the study of the Bible, and yet no one holds more distinctly and firmly to the idea of the supernatural in revelation than does he. It may be said, of course, and often has been said, that in this he is not consistent. But whether those who take this view are so much more logical and penetrating than he, while confessedly much less learned, is a question which all will not answer in the same way. We have no hesitation in recommending this volume to all who want to know what the Higher Criticism of the Bible is, and how the critical views can be consistent with orthodox Christianity. Those who desire to have within a small compass the means of thoroughly acquainting themselves with the critical analysis of the Hexateuch, can find nothing better than the volume here brought to their notice.

THE NEW APOLOGETIC. Five Lectures on True and False Methods of Meeting Modern Philosophical and Critical Attacks upon the Christian religion. By Milton S. Terry, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanstown, Ill. New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Curtis & Jennings. 1897. Page 199. Price, 85 cents.

Apologetic is the science of the defense of Christianity. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries this defense turned mainly upon the *authenticity* and *genuineness* of the sacred scriptures, and consisted of *external*, *internal*, and *collateral* evidence. That was the old apologetic. That kind of apologetic will no longer answer now. The whole world of thought has changed during the present century. Everything has become new. We have a new psychology, new philosophy, new exegesis, new biblical theology; and, so, it is but reasonable that we should also have a new apologetic.

A new apologetic, however, is demanded also from another point of view. The attacks upon Christianity are new. Christianity is not now assailed in the same spirit, and with the same weapons, as two or three generations ago. Professor Terry divides the attacks upon Christianity into three classes, namely, the philosophical, the literary, and those arising from the study of rival religions. Hence a three-fold apology becomes necessary, a philosophical, a literary or critical, and a comparative, to each of which a separate lecture is devoted. But this three-fold apology is only negative. It answers objections and wards off attacks. A positive apology is needed, which shall establish the truth of Christianity. The last lecture of the volume before us is devoted to this subject.

Under the head of the philosophic apology we have discussions of the theories of dualism, monism, and agnosticism. Of course the "conflict of science and religion" also comes in for a due

share of attention. Here the Christian apologist of the present time should learn a lesson from the past. Astronomy and geology were once regarded as foes of religion. Newton's theory of gravitation was condemned because it "made the deity superfluous." The recollection of these circumstances should have prevented modern apologists from engaging in battle with evolution. Evolution, according to Dr. Terry, is not a foe from which Christianity needs to be defended. And neither is literary criticism. The denial of the Solomonic authorship of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, the analysis of the Pentateuch and of Isaiah, and the supposition that the book of Daniel was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, are not matters upon which the truthfulness of Christianity should be staked. The new apologist must not fight the critics. He must find a way in which he can admit the imperfections of the Bible and yet maintain the divinity of his religion.

But the greatest difference between the old apologetic and the new relates to the different manner in which foreign religions are treated. According to the old apologetics all religions are divided into two classes, the *false* and the *true* or the *natural* and the *revealed*. All religions but the Christian are false, and contain no truth at all. They are natural, while Christianity is supernatural, and in its original form at least, as it exists in the Bible, contains no error at all. The new apologetic, on the other hand, is bound to assume that all religions are true and that there is a measure of divine revelation in all. Christianity is the absolute religion, the last and final stage in the process of religious evolution, that is, the process of divine revelation; and all the scattered truths which exist fragmentarily in ethnic religions, exist in their totality in Christianity. The Christian apologist may cheerfully allow that there are elements of truth in all religions, while he will claim that *the* truth is to be found in Christianity alone.

But this leads to the consideration of the positive apology for Christianity. Under this head the author mentions the absoluteness of the Christian religion, its survival of the errors and follies of its adherents, the freedom of thought which it encourages, its missionary tendency, its morally uplifting power, its adaptation to man's spiritual wants, its social effects, and its moral dynamics. These are all facts which make its truthfulness probable. But its demonstration it receives only from the person of its author. Jesus Christ Himself is the final argument for Christianity. Nothing shows the difference between the old apology and the new more clearly than the manner in which miracles are treated. "No man," says Dr. Terry, "now believes in Christ because of the miracles which He wrought two milleniums ago; we rather believe the miracles because we have first come to believe in Christ." Miracles can not be denied to Christ, but they must no

longer be explained as *violations*, or *suspensions* of the laws of nature, or as *deviations* from the ordinary course of nature. The miracles of revelation must be conceived "rather as a continuous manifestation of God, who immediately upholds and rules all things, visible and invisible." The miracles of Christ especially are symbols and types of the redemptive work which He is continually carrying on in the world.

It should be stated in conclusion that the work under notice does not pretend to be a complete treatment of the science of apologetics. It is merely an introduction to that science, laying down the principles according to which the science must in our time be treated; and as such we commend it to those who are interested in the subject.

THE LUTHERAN COMMENTARY, Volume X, Annotations on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and the Hebrews. By Edward J. Wolf, D.D., Professor of Church History and N. T. Exegesis, Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., and on Philemon, by Edward T. Horn, D.D., Pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Charleston, S. C. Pages 519. Price, \$2.00. Publishers, The Christian Literature Company, New York. 1897.

The idea of a *Lutheran* commentary will be apt to awaken distrust in many minds. A Lutheran Catechism, or a Lutheran Dogmatic, may be thought to be all right; but a *Lutheran commentary*! The Bible read through Lutheran spectacles, and interpreted in the light of Lutheran conceptions! In exegesis confessional and denominational prepossessions should have no place. The light in which the Bible should be interpreted is that which shines in the Bible itself, not that which proceeds from any ecclesiastical confession. The exegete and commentator should entirely forget his ecclesiastical relations, and be mindful only of his obligations to the objective truth of the word of God.

But after all such ecclesiastical independence on the part of a biblical theologian is a position which it is difficult to maintain; and the usual result is that a commentary is colored by the confessional and dogmatic prepossessions of its author. If a Roman Catholic writes a commentary, it will be sure to be a Roman Catholic commentary. And the same will be the case with the work of a Presbyterian, Methodist or Baptist. A Presbyterian will inevitably write a Calvinistic commentary, however much he may flatter himself that he is free from confessional bias; and a Methodist is nothing if not Arminian. Why should it not be so also with a Lutheran? And if he has the honesty and the courage to avow the fact, so much the better for him. The idea of a Lutheran commentary may then after all not involve so much of a contradiction as may at first sight appear.

In the volume before us the evidences of Lutheranism are, however, not very marked. We have not seen any of the preceding volumes of the series; but if they are all like the present one,

then we should say that the denominationalism is to be found rather in the general tone of propriety and orthodoxy, than in any distinctively Lutheran doctrines presented. Dr. Wolf, moreover, tells us in the preface to this volume that he is as much indebted to the Anglicans Ellicott and Westcott, and to the Reformed Van Aostersee and Ebrard, as he is to such pre-eminently Lutheran divines as Huther and Delitzsch. And a somewhat careful examination of the volume has convinced us that this statement is not unfounded, and that the commentary is in fact no less Catholic than commentaries generally are which do not appear under a denominational name.

The plan of this commentary is to furnish results rather than to show how they are reached. There is no display of scientific apparatus, and no review of exegetical opinions. The text adopted is that of the revised English version, the Greek being seldom referred to, except when necessary to illustrate the meaning of the English translation. This fits the commentary for the use of intelligent laymen as well as for that of ministers. The introductions to the various books are brief, giving simply conclusions without burdening the reader with discussions of opposing theories. The author has no doubt as to the genuineness of the *pastoral epistles*, remarking that the difference of style between them and St. Paul's unquestioned epistles can be explained by the difference of matter and the time of composition. Dr. Wolf accepts the hypothesis of the apostle's release from the Roman imprisonment described in the last chapters of the Acts, and supposes that first Timothy and Titus were written subsequently to this event, while second Timothy must have been written during a second imprisonment at Rome. In regard to the authorship and destination of the Epistle to the Hebrews Dr. Wolf accepts the current view of total uncertainty. We do not think, however, that he states the case against the notion of Pauline authorship strongly enough. He says that this notion has as much against it as for it. In our opinion internal evidence makes it *impossible* that Paul could have written this epistle.

The interpretations adopted in this volume are always conservative, and, as we think, generally correct. On some points, of course, we would dissent from the opinions of the commentator. For instance, the rule laid down in 1 Tim. iii. 2 that a "bishop must be the husband of one wife" is explained as referring to second marriages after the death of former wives, while we would suppose it to refer to polygamy or concubinage, which was not uncommon in that age in the Greek and Roman world. In commenting on the Epistle to the Hebrews it seems to us that our author sometimes resorts to forced interpretations in order to save a certain theory of inspiration. So, for instance, when in ix: 4, the golden altar is placed within the holy of holies of the temple, the commentator imagines that this statement is adopted by the

writer because on the day of atonement, when the veil was up, the golden altar was practically within the most holy place, standing directly before the ark. That is saving the writer's knowledge of the arrangement of the temple at the expense of his ability to state it clearly. So also the commentator accounts for the change, in the Septuagint of Ps. xl: 6, of the sentence, "Mine ears hast thou opened," into the sentence "A body didst thou prepare for me," by saying that "both texts teach essentially the same truth, namely, what sacrifices are acceptable to God." We would say that the translation of the Septuagint here presents an accidental error, of which the writer of Hebrews was unconscious. This would make his argument defective in form, while it would, however, not affect its substance. But the Epistle to the Hebrews is not an easy book for the commentator to deal with; and we think that Dr. Wolf has produced a work which must prove of great value for the class of readers for whom it was evidently designed. The same is true also of the commentary by Dr. Horn on the brief but exceedingly beautiful and tender Epistle to Philemon. Besides ministers, this commentary will be helpful to intelligent laymen and Sunday-school teachers, who desire more perfect knowledge of the Bible.

HOMILIES OF SCIENCE. By Dr. Paul Carus. Second Edition. Pages, 317. Price, 35 cents. Paper cover. The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago, Ills. 1897.

These *Homilies of Science* first appeared in the *Open Court*, a publication devoted to the "religion of science." They are short articles on a great variety of subjects, such as *revelation, God, nature, freedom, immortality, the soul, ethics, faith, doubt, etc.* They are written in a direct and interesting style, generally profound in thought, and elicit the attention of the intelligent reader, whether he agrees with the views expressed or not.

The religion of science, which it is the purpose of this publication to promote, is something which it is not easy to define. One can easily tell what it is not. It is not the religion of the Church or of any of the creeds of Christendom. Nor is it the religion of any of the ethnic establishments. It is called the religion of science in order to distinguish it from the religions of faith, because it claims to rest upon facts which may be stated with scientific exactness and circumspection. In the preface to this book we are told that it is the religion of humanity, the cosmic religion, the religion of life, and the religion of immortality. It should be stated, however, that by immortality the author does not seem to mean personal immortality, or the extension of personal consciousness beyond the death of the individual.

The only immortality there is for men is the immortality of the species. We live again in our offspring, and the conduct of our life largely shapes the fortunes of our posterity. This is the

source of ethics. And Dr. Carus has a great deal to say on ethical subjects, and generally treats them in a way that is calculated to lead one to hope that he himself is not far from the kingdom of God. Of God, too, he writes much, and makes various efforts to make his conception clear to his readers. God is not nothing; God is not a person; God is not nature; these are a few of his positions. Perhaps the following sentences, on page 93, come nearest to a positive definition of God: "God is nature in so far only as nature serves us as a regulative principle for our actions. God is the cosmos in so far only as its laws represent the ultimate authority of moral conduct." Dr. Carus rejects the theories of atheism, theism, and pantheism, and adopts as the proper designation of his own theory the term *entheism*. Of course he rejects the idea of the personality of God. God is mind, but not a mind—that is, not mind concentrated into the unity of self-consciousness.

We do not believe that Dr. Carus is going to make many converts to the religion of science. We rather hope that he himself will some day be converted back to the religious principles in which he was educated; for he is the son of a clergyman. Meanwhile we commend his book to the attention of thoughtful persons who desire to know something of "the possibilities of speculative thought."

THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Ch. Piepenbring, Pastor and President of the Reformed Consistory at Strassburg. Translated from the French, by permission of the author, with added references for English readers, by H. G. Mitchell, Professor in Boston University. Pages 361. New York, 46 East 14th Street. Thomas Y. Crowell & Company.

This is a most convenient volume for the study of a great and important science. Biblical Theology, as a distinct science, has thus far been cultivated only by the Germans; and even among the Germans the number of works devoted to the subject is not large. On the Old Testament we have Oehler, in two volumes, accessible also in an English translation. But Oehler is not up to time, and is besides, hard to read. In both of these respects this volume of Piepenbring's is far superior. It embodies the results of the latest critical scholarship both in Germany and in France; and in language and style it is all that any English reader could wish. The French language generally does not present the same difficulties to the English translator which the German presents, as it possesses more of the directness of the English.

M. Piepenbring, as will be observed, is a minister of the Reformed Church, and occupies an important official position in the city in which he lives and labors. But this does not prevent him from being a critical student of the Bible. The work before us, however, is not a work of criticism. The critical work is rather presupposed; and the author in general adopts the views which

are presented by the school of the higher critics. In the treatment of the theology of the Old Testament he adopts the historical method, which enables him to show how the various doctrines were gradually developed in the successive periods of Israelitish history. He makes *three periods*, the first extending from the earliest times to about the beginning of the eighth century, the second from the beginning of the eighth century to the end of the exile, and the third from the exile to about the middle of the second century, B. C. The literature of the Old Testament is distributed to the successive periods according to the views prevalent among the higher critics.

But is not this historical method of studying the Bible, which takes account of the development of ideas and customs in the course of time, admits more or less important divergencies among biblical documents, and allows the possibility of doctrinal and historical errors—is not this method of studying the Bible going to shake the foundations of faith? To this question we can not do better than to give the author's reply, which at once shows both the style and the spirit of the book: "Faith in the orthodox sense of intellectual adherence to a dogmatic system, considered as perfect and infallible, because, as it claims, it is drawn from an infallible source, and rests on its infallible authority—such a faith is evidently impaired beyond recovery by the historical study of the Bible. But is this true faith, faith in the biblical sense? Certainly not. It is the product of Jewish rabbinism and Christian dogmatism. Faith, as the Bible, especially the Old Testament, freed from rabbinical influence, understands it, is not faith in the sacred letter, the written word, but faith in the manifestations of God in history, in His interference in the world with a view to the salvation of humanity, faith in the living word, inspired by the divine spirit in the prophets, faith in the holy mission of these men of God. Now we claim that this faith is not impaired, and could not be, by the historical study of the Bible, because this faith has for its foundation not simple words, but facts, evident and undeniable facts," p. 345.

But space forbids our multiplication of examples of the author's teaching. Enough has, however, been said to give the reader an idea of the character of this book. The book furnishes in a brief compass an answer to the question, what sort of biblical theology is going to come out of the higher criticism, and shows that such theology may be consistent with the highest interests of religion.